

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3449

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not have any time to yield, unless I am given additional time.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be given additional time so that he may yield to me for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Oregon so that the Senator from Oregon may ask him a question?

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont may be given an additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Vermont being granted an additional minute?

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have 5 or 10 minutes or a half hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a feeling that the Senator from Vermont, as the dean on the Republican side of the aisle, may be able to get some information from my party's administration. If he is able to do so, we will be very grateful to him. I cannot get an answer from the administration. Therefore, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if he will try to find out what the reason is for moving some offices of the Treasury from Portland, Oreg., out of my State. There is only one-way traffic with regard to Oregon. All the offices are being moved out of the State, whether they concern the Treasury, the regional offices of the Post Office, or the Federal Power Commission. As I say, it is all one-way traffic in Oregon. We cannot understand the reason for this move. If the dean on the Republican side of the aisle can obtain the answer for us, he will be doing a great personal favor for the people of Oregon.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield, if the time is not taken out of my 10 minutes.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be given an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HART. First I should like to say that the commitment which had been given to the people of Michigan and to their delegation in Congress has gone completely by the board. After a careful and intensive survey it was determined by the Internal Revenue Service that a data-processing center, one of nine throughout the country, would be located in the Detroit metropolitan area, which embraces a region of many counties.

The reorganization plan proposed yesterday by the Treasury Department has removed that data-processing center.

To us this proposal must be a complete oversight. I say that because I am convinced that the administration would not go back on its commitment, given to us so solidly.

When we heard about it, we went to the White House. I believe that is the euphemistic way of referring to people without describing them further. At the White House we voiced our protest against this proposal.

I trust that the commitment given to us will be honored. If the Treasury Department has any concern about getting a tax bill through Congress, it ought to double check its relationship with Congress. The proposed step is not one which will be found in any basic text on how to get along with people or how to win friends.

Mr. AIKEN. I really appreciate the comments of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield me another 10 seconds?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont may have an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am particularly proud of myself for having asked the dean of the Republican side to get this information for me from the present administration, particularly the Republican Secretary of the Treasury, who, after all, must assume some responsibility for some of the moves. I should like to work with the Senator from Vermont to see if, between us, we can get an answer from the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know what degree of responsibility is assumed by the Republican Secretary of the Treasury.

Over the years, the Internal Revenue offices of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont—and I think I may include Rhode Island, too, since Rhode Island also is affected by this order—have been efficient and respected and have never been touched by the breath of scandal.

Why at this time should all these offices be moved into Boston? The personnel of those offices have served well for 20 years; yet now they are told that they will have to fight for their new jobs, if they can get them. The only assurance they have is that they will not have their pay cut or will not lose their jobs until after the next election—or 2 years from now.

Why should a system which has worked so well over the years now be upset in favor of one which is dubious?

In reply to the question asked by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], this latest act on the part of the Internal Revenue Service merely follows a pattern which, while it originated a long time ago, has been accelerated rapidly during the past 2 years, namely, the pattern of breaking down State lines and concentrating the activities in a few urban centers of wealth, population, industry, and political power.

It is said by the administration that this is being done in only 12 States; and that the other 38 States certainly will not complain. I hope the other 38 States are not deluding themselves in any way; their turn is coming. As soon as the administration has abolished the offices and destroyed the pride of management of good offices in 12 States, it will certainly select 12 more States. The administration has not tried to touch any State south of Delaware yet; but it will. I assure the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the Senators from the other Southern States that their turn will come. The administration is selecting a few States at a time in order to accomplish its program, but it is following a pattern of concentrating its power in a few great urban centers of the United States, from which operations can be more easily controlled by a few persons in Washington.

I hope I have made it clear that I do not approve of the action taken by the Secretary of the Treasury.

I observe the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] on his feet. If he wishes to defend New York, that is all right. I believe the regional office of the Internal Revenue Service in New England has been well handled and has been under good management. When the Government now seeks to consolidate district offices on a flimsy pretext, it is time for us to look out.

BAY OF PIGS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our sympathy goes out to the widows and children of the four Americans who were killed in the Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961. They were mature men, not boys seeking adventure. Possibly they were employees of the Central Intelligence Agency who had been given the job of training anti-Castro Cubans in Guatemala for the invasion then being planned. This was during the Eisenhower administration. According to news accounts, their pay was \$1,900 per month. Whether this big pay made them soldiers of fortune, if they volunteered for combat just before the ill-fated invasion, is a matter for argument. Undoubtedly, it was not expected that they would themselves engage in combat. Their job was to teach and train. Presumably in the excitement of the invasion, they offered to go in fighting. They became casualties of the Bay of Pigs invasion. It may be that the checks for \$225 received every other week by each of these four widows come from the CIA. It is said that these payments will continue until the widows remarry. Let us see: \$225 every other week amounts to approximately \$487 per month. Unfortunately there are a number of widows, with children now of college age, of officers of our Air Force who lost their lives in combat in the service of their country in World War II. Have those war widows whose husbands, Air Force pilots or bombardiers in World War II who died heroically for their country, received as much as \$487 per month from a grateful Government?

A niece of mine, whose husband, a young lawyer who became a tank captain and was killed in action in Europe in 1944, leaving her with a child who is now a college boy, must have read with surprise the newspaper accounts of the very substantial amounts of the checks received by these other widows, whose husbands were unfortunately killed in the Bay of Pigs invasion.

THE WELFARE OF OUR FARMERS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, although I am no longer a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which I had the honor to serve for 4 years under the chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I still have a great interest in the prosperity of our farmers. I am glad to observe the chairman in the Chamber. I hold him in high admiration for the achievements and the leadership of that committee during the 4 years of my service under his chairmanship.

The present administration has done much toward making less burdensome the serious problems with which our farmers were and are faced. I am positive that we in Congress shall continue to legislate for the welfare and prosperity of our farmers. I feel certain that this will be done so long as the present majority and the present chairman control the operations of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Therefore, I read with interest the editorial response to President Kennedy's farm message in two of Ohio's widely read, outstanding metropolitan newspapers, the Akron Beacon Journal and the Columbus Dispatch. Both recognize that farm legislation enacted by the 87th Congress reduced the surplus of wheat and feed grains, increased farm income, and put surplus foods to worthwhile use through school lunches, food stamp pilot programs, distribution to needy families, and the food-for-peace program. Both recognize that the President's farm proposals point the way to further farm program improvements.

Inasmuch as these editorials are thoughtful reviews of the farm situation and the operation of farm programs, I believe they merit the attention of my colleagues. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, Feb. 3, 1963]

FARM PROGRAM OFFERS SOME HOPE OF SOLUTION

President Kennedy's farm message to Congress omits most of the mandatory crop control proposals that stirred up a hornet's nest of opposition last year. In most respects the proposed program would retain the present system of voluntary controls in feed grains (with some amplification), make little change in the wheat program launched last year, and retain such features as the wheat referendum and the current system of price supports and bonuses.

The President and his farm advisers feel that the system, while not ideal, is beginning to work and already has made progress toward its goals.

The goals are considerable: Reduction of surpluses, reduction in expenditures for price-support programs, improved income for farm families, lower prices to consumers for food and fiber, and expanded exports.

Nevertheless, the President tells us, there is a substantial improvement in farm income, a substantial decrease in Government holdings of agricultural products, and a substantial reduction in costs to the taxpayer for carrying farm surpluses, without increasing the consumer's burden.

Probably the most vital phase of the program for Ohio is the part which pertains to feed grains. The President's proposals in this field include the following:

Extension of the current voluntary acreage-cutting program for perhaps 2 more years beginning with 1964, but with a contemplated easing of curbs next year. The general goal of keeping Government feed grain stock from dropping below the 45-million-ton supply deemed adequate as an emergency reserve, but continuing the reduction from the record high of 85 million tons in mid-1961. The reduction has come about mainly because of acreage cutting, increasing domestic consumption, and heavy exports.

The President called for an affirmative vote in the forthcoming wheat referendum to be held under the legislation enacted by Congress last year.

If two-thirds of the wheat producers in the Nation vote this spring to approve the bushel marketing law authorized by that law, the President declared, the present income of wheat farmers will be protected and "the overhanging surpluses of wheat will be further reduced."

Failure to approve the wheat program will leave the wheat farmer without either supply management or effective price supports—"at the mercy of unlimited production and unprotected prices."

If the wheat stabilization program is retained in the upcoming nationwide referendum, each wheat farmer will be assigned an acreage allotment. As previously, marketing quota penalties apply to excess wheat. Marketing quotas do not apply to farms that have 15 acres or less of wheat for harvest.

A support averaging \$1.82 per bushel, nationally, on the 1963 wheat production will be available to a farmer who complies with his farm acreage allotment. In addition, an 18-cent-per-bushel price support payment will be available if the farmer complies with the 1963 stabilization program in its entirety.

Ohio wheat farmers traditionally have rejected the Government program because of deep-rooted opposition to Government intervention. As in the past, if the control program is voted this year, it will be because of the favorable vote in the Western States, with their huge wheat acreage, where the farmers want to make sure they receive the Government price support.

The Ohio farmer then is in the position of being able to take advantage of the price supports, meanwhile submitting to the control features which are distasteful to him.

An imponderable in the farm picture and the efficacy of the intricately devised program, replete with political concessions one way and the other, is the weather. One drought year, for instance, could wipe out the surplus in feed grains. The effect of prolonged subzero winter weather or a late planting of corn due to heavy spring rains and flooding, perhaps followed by unfavorable growing weather, could throw even so cleverly-devised a program into disarray, with deeply disturbing results.

Because of its voluntary compliance features and some evidence that the program is working favorably in most of its several aspects, farmers generally, we believe, will look with reasonable favor on the President's latest version of his farm program, although some organized elements already are arrayed against it.

For one thing, the administration, we understand, does not plan to put all its proposals in one package, on which all its provisions would have to rise or fall. Instead, the various phases of the program are to be presented in separate bills, which will allow fuller debate and separate votes on the proposals affecting various crops and dairy products, food distribution, land use adjustment, rural electrification, vocational training and water retention.

Whether the program will bring order out of chaos, or produce more chaos, remains to be seen, but there is more reasonableness in the President's program as laid down in Congress last week than in some of the earlier approaches and recommendations.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal, Feb. 1, 1963]

THAT FARM PROBLEM

President Kennedy yesterday talked about the problem which is the envy of Premier Khrushchev—the over-production of farm commodities.

Whereas the Russian Communists—and the Chinese Communists, too—carry on an endless, uphill struggle to expand agricultural production to meet the bare requirements of their people, the chronic problem here is just the opposite.

The President summed it up when he said:

"Our capacity to produce still outruns the growth of both domestic and foreign demand for food and fiber. Our abundance must still be harnessed in such a way as to bring supply and demand more nearly into balance. And the benefits of our agricultural progress still need to be translated into improved income to farm families, lower prices to consumers for food and fiber, expanded exports, and reduced expenditures for price support programs."

Mr. Kennedy's message was not entirely gloomy.

Net farm income at the end of 1962 was \$1.8 billion a year higher than in 1960. Government stockpiles of surplus grain are down by 929 million bushels from their 1961 peak. Exports of farm commodities reached a record \$5.1 billion in fiscal 1962. The emergency and temporary feed grain legislation of 1961 has been successful. Surplus foods have been put to good use through a variety of programs—school lunches and surplus commodity distribution to needy families, the food stamp experiment, and the overseas food-for-peace program.

But there was much to be reported on the negative side.

Unless wheat producers vote this spring to approve the bushel marketing program authorized by the 1962 law, wheat farmers again will be at the mercy of unlimited production and unprotected prices. New legislation is necessary to preserve the gains made in corn and other feed grains. The cotton industry is in trouble; help is needed both for producers and for textile mills.

And as for the dairy industry, the President reminded Congress that he warned last year that failure to pass legislation in this field would cost the Treasury \$440 million a year in price support payments. The legislation was not passed. What happened?

"Costs have recently been running at a rate in excess of \$500 million a year, and the income of the dairy farmer has fallen by over \$100 million a year," Mr. Kennedy said.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3457

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAUS, MAN WHO SAVED POLITICAL SCIENCE, VISITS UNIVERSITY AFTER 16 YEARS

(By Elliott Maraniss)

Prof. John M. Gaus, the man who saved political science from dying of irrelevancy—the Dutch elm disease in the groves of academe—has returned to the University of Wisconsin campus.

Dr. Gaus will spend a week here visiting his old classes in public administration, regional planning, and political theory.

Among the political scientists in South Hall, this has aroused the same kind of excitement that would be found among historians if Frederick Jackson Turner suddenly showed up at old Bascom.

In the opinion of Prof. James McCamy, one of Dr. Gaus' hosts this week, the comparison is appropriate.

"Professor Gaus is to political science what Turner was to history," Dr. McCamy said Monday.

"He took it out of the law books and put it into life, among the people and in the communities in which they live. He said government is not just statutes and constitutions, but people dealing with other people."

For 20 memorable years between 1927 and 1947 the Wisconsin campus and the Badger State were the vineyards of Professor Gaus' fruitful labors.

A graduate of Amherst College with a master's degree and a doctorate from Harvard, he came here to become part of an Amherst triumvirate which made an imperishable contribution to Wisconsin's rise to greatness.

Dr. Alexander Meikeljohn had been president of Amherst, and Dr. Walter Agard had been an Amherst classmate. Dr. Gaus happily responded to their invitation to join them here in establishing the famed Experimental College. Dr. Agard taught the first-year course in Greek civilization and Dr. Gaus taught the second-year course in American civilization.

In those years the Wisconsin idea—putting the resources of the university in the service of the people of the State—provided a perfect basis for Dr. Gaus' ideas about political science.

Gov. Phil LaFollette named him executive secretary of the Wisconsin State Planning Board, an advisory board of legislators and citizens, charged with the task of "making a continuing inventory of the State government and its functions and suggesting ways as to how the State may operate more efficiently and economically."

Together with Robert Goodman, who later became chairman of the Conservation Commission, F. L. Sensenbrenner, then president of Kimberly Clark, Charles W. Nash, then president of the Nash Motor Co., Dr. Gaus and his board made many important recommendations, the most lasting of which was a far-sighted plan for the uses of the State's forest resources.

As a member of the Madison Area Planning Council, Dr. Gaus helped devise an orderly plan for the growth of the city.

In every one of those 20 years Dr. Gaus was the object of flattering and bountiful offers from rich and famous universities such as Harvard and Chicago, but he turned them all down, saying "Wisconsin is where my heart belongs."

Ironically, it was during one of those dark periods when the Wisconsin spirit faltered temporarily that Dr. Gaus finally left here.

In 1947 the board of regents refused to appoint Prof. Howard J. McMurray to the political science faculty. Dr. McMurray had served a term in Congress and had sought political office as a Democratic candidate two other times while a member of the faculty.

Dr. Gaus disagreed with the regents' decision and accepted an offer to go to Harvard as professor of government. At Harvard, Dr. Gaus' reputation continued to grow and was culminated with his election as president of the American Political Science Association.

In June of 1961, Dr. Gaus retired as professor emeritus of government at Harvard and returned with his wife to a farmstead in the lovely dairy and forest country in the Adirondacks in New York State, where he was born 68 years ago, the grandson of German immigrants.

There, Dr. Gaus said in an interview Monday, he has found a perfect laboratory for his lifelong interest in the interaction of city and country.

"I really don't know what kind of society we are coming into," Dr. Gaus said. "There are thousands of people who live in the open country, yet are city oriented in their work and their recreation."

Dr. Gaus said the metropolitan areas of the country are faced with "tremendous problems" presented by the profound changes in distribution of the American population, not only in terms of space but also in terms of employment and technological development.

He remains hopeful, however, that the problems will be solved.

"It's amazing how people will respond to a really objective, factual diagnosis of what is going on if you put it to them in human terms," Dr. Gaus said.

Putting things in human terms is what Dr. Gaus has been doing all his life.

SOVIET CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Washington Post has published two very fine editorials dealing with the problem of Soviet Cuba. While it is believed by Government officials that last fall we were successful in forcing removal of Soviet intermediate and medium range missiles and bombers, it is now recognized that the Soviets are continuing to maintain a powerful military base in this hemisphere.

The first editorial, published on March 4, strongly affirms:

Peace in this hemisphere will not be secure as long as Castro rules in Cuba. * * * The regime in Cuba is one with which its neighbors will not be permitted to live in peace.

The second editorial this morning is still more explicit. It suggests that the distinction between defensive and offensive weapons may have been erroneous or largely a semantic one. It then calls for an end to recriminations over the past and a recognition that Castro's Communist regime in Cuba is a very real threat to the safety of every democratic regime in its vicinity.

With that view I am in full agreement. Our concern must be with the danger Soviet Cuba poses at the present moment. This is a much more important issue than what the situation may have been in the past.

These editorials clarify the perils of the present situation and, in my judgment, emphasize the need for a firm and effective policy to meet the problem, a policy which, so far as I know, has not been made evident.

I ask unanimous consent to have both editorials printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

NO PEACE WITH CUBA

Peace in this hemisphere will not be secure as long as Castro rules in Cuba. That is the meaning of the events of the past week—whether they relate to disclosures of Cuba's role in training subversive forces in neighboring countries or to the movement of Soviet personnel from Cuban ports. No one will ever be sure how much subversion is going on and, in spite of the efficacy of aerial surveillance, no one can be certain how large are the remaining Soviet forces.

The regime in Cuba is one with which its neighbors will not be permitted to live in peace. The threat to the security and peace will rise and fall as their own precautions are extended or contracted. There is every present indication that no country can afford to allow its guard to relax.

As long as Cuba remains a center from which Communist infiltration is carried on, it cannot expect the United States or any of its other neighbors to make any firm pledge against the invasion of Cuba. The day may arrive when these belligerent operations will reach a level of military significance to which there will be no appropriate response but military operations. To make sure that this pitch of activity is not achieved in total secrecy the scrutiny of operations on the island must be maintained at the highest level.

The Western Hemisphere must live in danger while this situation persists. The precautions necessary to contain this threat are so onerous, disagreeable, and unsettling that the United States will be under continuous pressure to take arms against this sea of trouble and end it. Were there any assurance that it could indeed be ended by extreme measures, it would be harder to resist such counsels. There is, however, no assurance that even this dangerous alternative would end the crisis. It might only start a greater crisis.

There is no easy escape from the Cuban nuisance. There is no present alternative to the maintenance of a high state of readiness for extreme action, a continuous scrutiny of Cuban measures for signs of increasing hostility, an unremitting readiness to defend any threatened country in the hemisphere. All that we can be sure of for the moment is that as long as this regime lasts, there can be no real peace.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1963]

PAST AND FUTURE IN CUBA

What is going to be done about Cuba tomorrow is a question of such pressing urgency for the survival of freedom in the Western Hemisphere that it is too bad to see it put into eclipse by a debate over what was done about Cuba yesterday.

The intellectual resources of the administration and of its opponents, unfortunately, seem to be going chiefly into the controversy about the past. No aspect of this debate is more unproductive than that which centers about the date when the administration decided that the Soviet arms buildup was offensive in character and so dangerous as to require the strong measures that were taken. The charges that the administration knew of the offensive character of the weaponry long before it disclosed its knowledge and acted on it is essentially political in character. If the charge ever is proven true or false it will leave the future quite unaffected.

Perhaps the administration erred in trying to make a distinction between defensive and offensive arms. Certainly it is a very difficult thing to do. The argument is largely a semantic one. The antiaircraft weapons, the defending fighters and the antimissile missiles are defensive in one sense of the word. They are, at the same time, components in any offensive weapon

system. As it turns out, these weapons in Cuba were the first components in a total offensive weapons system that became complete with the arrival of intermediate range missiles. In this sense, they were offensive weapons—or, at least, parts of an offensive weapons system, from the beginning.

There is some evidence that Chairman John McCone of the CIA began to suspect this before the heavy missiles arrived. If this Government had acted on these suspicions, however, its posture might have been difficult. Could it have acted with the firmness it exhibited once the intermediate range missiles were in place? If it had, wouldn't Cuba and the Soviet Union have blandly asserted that only defensive weapons were installed? And wouldn't the vigorous measures of the administration have seemed premature, in this context? Surely, they would have seemed premature to most of our NATO allies and to many South American governments. A strong case can be made for the argument that the American timing, whether due to ignorance, concealment or design, was well suited to achieve the desired result. A little earlier would have been too early and a little later might have been too late.

The debate over what was right or wrong with the operations of last October is not as urgent as the debate over what is the right thing for this country to do now. Castro's Communist regime in Cuba is a very real threat to the safety of every democratic regime in its vicinity. The administration is unable to perfect, or at least unable to disclose, measures for dealing with it that seem adequate. In the absence of plans for dealing with it, those who argue for the most extreme measures are having a field day. They can enlist behind dangerous and oversimplified solutions the well-known American belief that you can "do something" about every problem. The administration runs the risk that this impulse will push it into doing something reckless and unwise unless it can perfect and disclose a policy that is safer and sounder than the policies its critics propose.

VETERANS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, several days ago my attention was directed to a new and very informative pamphlet on the veterans in Montana. The document is based on information gathered in the 1960 census.

I am proud, as is every Montanan, of the major contribution made by the men and women of the Treasure State in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. Eight out of every ten Montana men between the ages of 35 and 89 years are war veterans, a record of which we are extremely proud.

The research staff at the Veterans' Administration has brought together a number of interesting and helpful facts on the veterans of my State. The statistics cover such things as length of service, residence, occupation, education, and a number of personal details. The Administrator, J. S. Gleason, Jr., is to be complimented for a job well done.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the Record the summary which appears on pages 1 through 4 of the pamphlet.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

VETERANS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA, 1960

SUMMARY

Three out of eight of the civilian males 18 or more years old living in Montana in April 1960 had served in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War I, World War II, or the Korean war. Another 6 percent had served only during peacetime.

Fifty-four percent of the State's 89,300 male veterans, as compared to 47 percent of the 114,800 nonveteran males 18 years old or over, were living in cities and towns. One-third of both veterans and nonveterans lived in rural nonfarm areas. Proportionately fewer veterans than nonveterans lived on farms (veterans, 1 out of 8; nonveterans, 1 out of 5).

Of the 89,300 veterans in Montana, 51,100 had served in World War II; 17,600 in the Korean war (of whom 2,800 were also World War II veterans); and 11,400 in World War I. The remaining veterans (12,000) were peacetime ex-servicemen, except for about 180 Spanish-American War veterans.

The median age of the 89,300 veterans in April 1960 was 38.3 years. World War I veterans were the oldest—median, 68.4 years. World War II veterans were 40.2 years old (median), and Korean war veterans were 29.2 years old (median). The other service veterans were the youngest (median—25.0 years), reflecting the fact that most of them had served in the Armed Forces since the Korean war ended in January 1955.

Eight out of 10 men in Montana between the ages of 35 and 39 years were war veterans. Four out of every 10 men 25 and older had served in the Armed Forces during a war period. The lowest proportions of war veterans to total males were 1 out of 8 for the 55- to 59-year age group; 1 out of 8 for the 70 years and over group; and 1 out of 20 for the youngest males—18 to 24 years.

Of the 58 counties in the State, Yellowstone had the most male veterans: 10,100 war veterans and 1,500 peacetime ex-servicemen. Petroleum County had the smallest veteran population: 103 war veterans and no peacetime ex-servicemen.

Of the State's 89,300 male veterans, 80 percent were married; almost 15 percent were single; 4 percent were divorced; and 2 percent were widowed.

Six out of ten Montana veterans were living in a different house in April 1960 than they had occupied 5 years earlier. Three out of ten moved within the same county and one out of eight moved from one Montana county to another. One out of seven male veterans had moved to Montana from another State since 1955. The movers (those who had lived in a different house in 1955) were more than 8 years younger than the veterans who remained at the same address (median age: movers, 35.2 years; nonmovers, 43.6 years). Veterans who moved within the county were almost 2 years older (median age, 36.9 years) than those who moved to another county in Montana (median age, 35.2 years). The veterans who came to Montana from another State were even younger; median age, 33.2 years.

The average veteran in Montana had finished part of the first year of college. One out of eight had completed 1 to 3 years of college; another one out of eight was a college graduate (1 out of 20 had finished 1 or more years of postgraduate study). Three out of ten completed high school, but not a year or more of college. One out of five (19 percent) completed his education with 1 to 3 years of high school; and one out of four (26 percent) had completed no more than 8 years of elementary school.

Eighty-eight percent of the Montana male veterans were members of families—9 out of 10 of them were family heads, the others were related to the family head (son, father, or other relative). Another 1 out of 10 were living alone or with unrelated persons. Of

the 2 percent (1,800) who were not living in households, 4 out of 10 were in institutions, and 6 out of 10 lived in roominghouses, college dormitories, and other group quarters.

In April 1960, 84 out of 100 (74,500) male veterans in Montana were working; another 5 out of 100 (4,800) were unemployed. The 11 out of 100 veterans who were not in the labor force were about 27 years older than those in the labor force (median age—64.1 years as compared to 37.5 years).

One-third (34 percent) of the employed Montana veterans in 1960 were craftsmen, foremen, operatives, and similar workers. One-fourth were professional and technical workers, managers, officials, and proprietors. One out of eight employed veterans was a clerical or sales worker; 1 out of 6 was a service worker, laborer, or farmworker; and 1 out of 10 was a farmowner or manager.

Median personal income in 1959 of Montana male veterans was \$4,653. Veterans between 35 and 44 years old had the highest income (median, \$5,502); those 70 years old and over had the lowest (median, \$2,041). Six percent of all veterans reported incomes of \$10,000 or more. One out of five (18 percent) had less than \$2,000 and 1 out of 12 had under \$1,000 of income in 1959.

Five thousand, eight hundred and fifty seven dollars was the median income in 1959 of the Montana families headed by male veterans. Twelve percent of these families had an annual income of \$10,000 or more; 36 percent had between \$6,000 and \$10,000; 30 percent reported income from \$4,000 to \$6,000; and 22 percent had under \$4,000. One out of eight veterans' families had a 1959 income of less than \$3,000.

Of the 9,900 Montana veterans who were unrelated individuals—living alone, or with nonrelatives, or in noninstitutional group quarters—4 out of 10 had less than \$2,000 of income in 1959; 3 out of 10 reported between \$2,000 and \$4,000; 2 out of 10 (18 percent) had between \$4,000 and \$6,000; and over 1 out of 10 had \$6,000 or more. Their median annual income was \$2,580, compared with the \$4,653 median personal income of all veterans.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for all its emphasis on the need for increased material benefits to the people of Latin America, we should not lose sight of the fact that the Alliance for Progress represents first and foremost a battle for men's minds. This makes the work of the Alliance in the field of education of crucial importance.

Although largely unpublicized, the work of Alliance and AID people in raising educational standards is going forward on several fronts. The magnitude of the operation is summarized very well in a speech by the Honorable Teodoro Moscoso, coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, before the California Teachers Association in Los Angeles on March 1.

After reviewing the general problem of illiteracy in areas of Latin America—and the factors contributing to it—Mr. Moscoso outlines what is being done in the field of teacher training, school construction, furnishing of school supplies, assistance to higher education and student scholarships. Even with luck, it will be a long time before significant results of our effort can be pointed to. Yet some of our first steps have been very promising.

For instance, some 2½ million primary readers—costing only about 12 cents

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

3571

needed in the education of exceptional children.

Title V of the bill authorizes appropriations of \$5 million for fiscal 1964, \$10 million for fiscal 1965, and such sums as the Congress may thereafter determine to be necessary for research and demonstration grants to State agencies, colleges and universities, or public and other nonprofit educational or research organizations for projects which hold promise of improving special education and related services to exceptional children.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD of yesterday, Wednesday, March 6, be corrected in the following respects:

Page 3359, "recently" should be "recently:"—add colon.

Corrections for: Minnesota Taconite, pages 3380-3384.

Page 3387, "department of taxation" should be capitals "D and T".

Page 3381, "taxation"—should be capital "T".

Page 3381, "makes" should be "make".

Page 3382, "whom" should be "which".

Page 3382, "Anderson" should be "Andersen".

Page 3384, "a" should be "at".

Page 3384, "told" should be "said".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT
OF 1963

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled the "Presidential Transition Act of 1963." This is similar to H.R. 12479 which I introduced in the 87th Congress.

This bill was introduced by me to carry out a recommendation made to the Congress by President Kennedy on May 29, 1962, along with certain other proposals dealing with the financing of presidential election campaigns. The various proposals resulted from a study and report prepared by the President's Commission on Campaign Costs. This was a bipartisan committee made up of members with varied and extensive experience in political finance, such as Alexander Heard, Chairman; V. O. Key, Jr.; Dan Kimball; Malcolm C. Moos; Paul A. Porter; Nell O. Staebler; Walter N. Thayer; John M. Vorys; and James C. Worthy.

My bill deals with the transfer of executive power when there is to be a change of administration. It is related to the problem of campaign financing because it was estimated by the Commission that in 1952-53, the cost to a special Republican committee of the transition period between the election and the inauguration of President Eisenhower exceeded \$200,000. In 1960-61 the cost to the Democratic National

Committee for the transition period preceding the inauguration of President Kennedy totaled at least \$360,000.

These figures cover only a proportion of the costs involved in the transition period between changes of administration. During this time the President-elect must select his Cabinet, the Ambassadors to man diplomatic posts all over the world, top echelon administrative officials, as well as key personnel to staff governmental and White House executive offices.

Some of the individuals chosen by the President-elect to fill crucial roles in the construction and maintenance of the new administration, in the past, have been able to do so only at considerable personal sacrifice. Transportation of such individuals is in itself an expensive item. Housing during the conference period is also costly. When the conferences end in an appointment, the new appointee in most cases must incur hotel expenses until permanent housing is procured. The requirement to work without pay for 2 or 3 months while incurring the increased personal expenditures is an unreasonable demand upon persons of limited means. Some of the special studies requested by President-elect Kennedy were produced through the generosity of his consultants, not only with respect to their own time but with respect to the substantial clerical and administrative costs as well. Such costs in 1960-61 totaled almost \$1 million, in addition to the \$360,000 payment by the Democratic National Committee.

The time is long since past when an American President may dispense with all but a few preliminaries in assuming office. The size and complexity of today's Federal Government, the pressing domestic and international problems facing the President, all combine to make it imperative that the machinery of transition be as efficient as possible and sufficient resources available for the required orientation of the new leader.

This orientation can only be provided by the outgoing administration. Therefore, it must be recognized as a legitimate function of government and a legitimate expense of government. Under present conditions, a new President, in one sense, begins working for the Government the morning after the election.

It is understood that both President-elect Eisenhower and President-elect Kennedy were given the cooperation of their predecessors and access to needed information. This is a tribute to the intelligent and friendly attitude of all these gentlemen. But at this period of our history, I believe it more fitting that we establish a formal process supported by law. Rather than leave this important matter to the discretion or whim of the individuals concerned, it would seem wisdom to guard against the dangers of noncooperation, remote as they may be. Under certain circumstances, such as a campaigning incumbent defeated by the President-elect in a hard fought campaign, such dangers could arise.

I submit that the vital transition of Executive power from the outgoing to the incoming administration is a matter of

bipartisan national interest. The use of political party funds for such an activity is not desirable. Nor can we escape the fact that there is a lack of dignity in a system which requires party solicitors to seek out private funds to support the necessary activities of the President-elect of the United States.

Briefly, the bill I am bringing before you does the following:

Section 1 gives the title: "The Presidential Transition Act of 1963."

Section 2 declares its purpose to promote the orderly transfer of Executive power during the several months of transition from one administration to the other.

Section 3 authorizes certain services to be provided by the General Services Administration to President-elect and Vice-Presidents-elect, such as office space, compensation for staff personnel and experts, travel expenses, and so forth.

Section 4 authorizes necessary services, office space, and so forth to outgoing Presidents and Vice Presidents for 6 months following the expiration of their terms.

Section 5 authorizes the Congress to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to the fact that this bill to provide Federal Government funds for the vital transition of Executive power from the outgoing to the incoming administration has received the endorsement of President Kennedy and former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower, as well as former presidential candidates Thomas E. Dewey, Adlai E. Stevenson, and Richard M. Nixon.

John M. Bailey and Congressman WILLIAM E. MILLER, the chairman of the two major political parties, have also lent their full endorsement and support.

Mr. Speaker, I can see no valid reason why this body should not enact the necessary legislation to meet this kind of transition as a matter of organized procedure and as a matter of law in order to orient and in order to effect the orderly transition of power into the new Government, particularly, Mr. Speaker, at a time when it is extremely necessary for a new Government taking over this Government of ours to be able to meet almost immediately the challenges which are constantly hurled at us, the American people, every hour of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

(Mr. LIPSCOMB (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. LIPSCOMB'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CUBAN CAVES

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

3572

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, I made a statement concerning Cuban caves which appeared on page 3086 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At the time, I stated I had written to the Legislative Reference Service asking for any available information on Cuban caves. The information I received was fragmentary and inconclusive.

At the end of my statement, I called upon the administration to release any information it possessed concerning Cuban caves. I did this because the administration had set a precedent in releasing aerial photographs of missile sites last fall. Also, the gravity of the situation led me to believe that the American people should know—one way or another—about Cuban caves.

This morning, the Chicago Tribune has a large headline, Cuban Caves Hide Arms. The article was written by the distinguished journalist, Willard Edwards, of the Chicago Tribune press service. The Edwards article is based on testimony by Army Intelligence Chief Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch before the Senate Armed Services Committee yesterday.

Mr. Edwards says in the article:

Aerial photography has further revealed the building of new roads to cave locations. Major General Fitch testified, and it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground.

I wish to insert the complete Chicago Tribune story at this point in my remarks:

**CUBAN CAVES HIDE ARMS—AERIAL PHOTOS
BARE BUILDING OF NEW ROADS—RUSSIAN
TROOPS SHOW MUCH ACTIVITY**
(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—The Army's intelligence chief reported to Senate investigators today that Russian troops in Cuba are showing much activity in connection with caves throughout the island.

Aerial photography has further revealed the building of new roads to cave locations, Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch testified, and "it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground."

MISSILE CREWS LEAVE

"To date, there are no indications that Russian ground force units have departed from Cuba other than those associated with the missile systems which were removed last fall," Fitch said.

This information was contained in a statement released as Fitch went into a closed session with the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, headed by Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, which is probing all angles of the Cuban threat.

"Cuban refugees continue to report that strategic missiles were not all actually removed from Cuba and that they have been stored in caves and underground installations," Fitch stated.

"While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis, it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time of the quarantine last October 22.

"From the large volume and frequency of reports concerning the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft, it is certain that there is con-

siderable activity in connection with underground installations throughout the island.

"In numerous cases, reports indicate that this activity is being carried out solely by Soviet personnel and that Cubans, including highly placed military, are not permitted access thereto."

AIR-CONDITIONED CAVES

"There are several thousand caves in Cuba and many have been used for storage over the years. With the reported addition of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment, many would be suited to storage of both large and delicate electronic items."

Fitch said there had been "a substantial increase both in quantity and quality of heavy military equipment in Cuba in the last year.

"Modern tanks, artillery mortars, and motor transport vehicles have been noted, including the free rocket overground [Frog] missile which has a nuclear capacity," Fitch reported. "Other missiles and armored personnel carriers are similar to those in use by American forces," he said.

INCLUDES T-54 TANKS

"Other modern items in Cuba include the T-54 tank with a 100 mm. gun, similar to our M-60 main battle tank with 105 mm. gun," he told the committee. "There are also medium tanks, truck-mounted multiple rocket launchers, and amphibious personnel carriers.

"With the introduction of this equipment into Cuba, the potential firepower and mobility of ground forces has been increased considerably. We do not believe any of the sophisticated equipment—rocket launchers and tanks—have yet been turned over to the Cubans.

"Training activities have been intensified, improving the capabilities of Cuban personnel to utilize Soviet equipment. No nuclear warheads are believed to be in Cuba although it is possible that they could be used by some of the weapons systems there."

Today's Washington Post & Times Herald carried an article on page 2 entitled "Army Gives Report on Cuba Caves." Staff Reporter John G. Norris quotes Major General Fitch as saying:

Cuban refugees continue to report that strategic missiles were not all actually removed from Cuba and that they have been stored in caves.

General Fitch goes on to say:

While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis, it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed.

Although General Fitch conceded that "ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft" might be stored in "several thousand caves," he was unable to confirm or deny that Soviet missiles had been completely removed from Cuba.

The complete Washington Post article follows:

ARMY GIVES REPORT ON CUBA CAVES

(By John G. Norris)

The Army's intelligence chief testified yesterday that thousands of caves in Cuba are being used to store Soviet weapons. But he voiced doubt that the hidden war stocks include offensive missiles or bombers.

Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, reporting to the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee in its investigation of the Russian military buildup there, gave the most detailed official report yet on what American intelligence knows about underground weapons storage in Cuba.

A censored version of his testimony in

closed session, released to the press, also declared that:

To date there are no indications that Soviet ground force units have left Cuba other than those associated with the withdrawn missile forces.

No nuclear warheads are believed to be in Cuba, although they possibly could be used by some of the Soviet weapons systems now there.

REFUGEE REPORTS

In his discussion of the underground weapons storage, Fitch said that "Cuban refugees continue to report that strategic missiles were not all actually removed from Cuba and that they have been stored in caves."

"While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis," he went on, "it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed."

But Fitch said that in light of the large volume and frequency of intelligence reports about the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft it is certain that there is much activity in connection with the several thousand caves in Cuba.

Reports indicate, he said, that such underground storage is handled by Russians and that Cubans—including high-ranking military men—are not allowed access to the caves.

SUITABLE FOR STORAGE

Intelligence reports tell of the use of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment in the caves, which would make them suitable for storage of both large and delicate electronic items. Aerial photography, Fitch reported, has revealed that roads have been built to both known and suspected cave locations.

In the 6-month period before the mid-October Cuban crisis, Fitch said, military intelligence received about 3,000 reports that were evaluated and coordinated with the data obtained from aerial reconnaissance.

Fitch listed the following heavy modern army equipment introduced into Cuba: T-54 tanks mounting a 100-millimeter gun; SU-100 assault guns of similar caliber on tracks; truck-mounted multiple rocket launchers; Snapper wire-guided antitank missiles; new (1961 model) 8-wheeled armored personnel carriers; Frog missiles, similar to the U.S. Honest John rockets, with a nuclear capability; artillery mortars, and amphibious personnel carriers.

This equipment, Fitch said, increases considerably the potential firepower and mobility of Communist forces in Cuba. But he added that it was doubted that any of the more sophisticated weapons had as yet been turned over to the Cubans, although training to this end has been intensified.

Major General Fitch's testimony before the Armed Services Committee yesterday gives us little to be happy about. However, I applaud the fact that this administration has seen fit to tell the American people just what it knows about Cuban caves.

I hope as time goes on that we will have more precise information concerning Soviet weapons in Cuba. The American people have a right to know the nature and extent of the Cuban threat to this hemisphere.

HOW STRONG IS THE DOLLAR?

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

3575

eral courts, but at the same time to preserve existing State law in the same field. Most cases of unfair competition tend to be brought in the Federal courts and it is expected that in the future such cases would invoke the new statute. However, a plaintiff who wished to invoke State law would be free to proceed in the State court based on the same facts that also would create a right of action under the new Federal statute; such a party would be entitled to all the benefits of State law if he chose to pursue them, either in addition to or in substitution for the Federal right of action, entirely unaffected by the provisions of the bill.

Section 10 contains definitions of a number of terms used in the bill. Most of these are borrowed almost verbatim from the definition section of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. 1127).

Section 11 is the customary saving clause for partial invalidity.

Section 12 provides that the new statute shall take effect immediately upon its enactment, but that it shall not affect any proceeding pending at that time.

Section 13 provides a short title for the statute, viz., the Unfair Commercial Activities Act.

FREE ENTERPRISE—THE TRUE FOUNDATION OF A FREE WORLD

(Mr. YOUNGER (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently one of America's leading industrialists and builders was honored for his contributions to the free enterprise system we cherish so much. The man selected to receive the first International Broadcasting Award was Henry J. Kaiser. Mr. Kaiser has played an important role in the growth of the industrial might of this country, and more recently, the developing nations of the world.

True to his credo, "Find a Need and Fill It," Mr. Kaiser is searching the corners of the earth for opportunities that will help all mankind enjoy a fuller, more rewarding life. It has been said that Mr. Kaiser never looks back upon his accomplishments—instead, he constantly is looking ahead, seeking out new areas of need.

As he accepted the Free Enterprise Award he presented such an inspiring appraisal of the future that I wanted to call your attention to his enthusiastic forecast. I ask unanimous consent to place into the body of the RECORD his remarks at the International Broadcasting Award dinner on February 26 in Hollywood:

FREE ENTERPRISE—THE TRUE FOUNDATION OF A FREE WORLD

(By Henry J. Kaiser)

Tonight I salute the great world of broadcasting and advertising, embracing, as you do, drama, entertainment, music, song, art, the printed and spoken word—the most powerful force of all time to bring pleasure, enlightenment, and the fruits of free enterprise to people.

I am grateful with all my heart for the award you have presented me. Yet after saying "thank you more than I can voice"—I would prove unworthy of the honors if I didn't say—"now let's get on with our jobs ahead."

What kind of a tomorrow are we going to build?

What will the United States be like in the mid-1970's and by the year 2000?

Fortunately we have some solid forecasts in figures. Our Government joined two national planning associations in predicting what Americans will achieve in the last one-third of this century.¹

Their report, just issued, stimulates me tremendously. The experts look at the long-pull trends.

The trouble with short-run estimates often is that forecasts just for this year may be conflicting and confusing, perhaps influenced by a temporary situation or clashing theories. Under short-range estimates, the forecaster may miss the forest for the trees.

But this long-range forecast takes account of the historic past performance of our economy and projects the trends that should prevail.

So here are highlights of this official forecast for the year 1976:

Only 13 years from now—this country's annual output of goods and services will reach about one thousand billion dollars.

Our employment will exceed 92 million with the labor force one-third again as large as now.

Almost 70 percent of American families will be earning, at current prices, more than \$6,000 a year.

America's population will top 235 million people.

Two-thousand-miles-an-hour planes will fly us from Los Angeles to New York in 90 minutes—New York to Moscow in 2 hours.

Those are some of the official forecasts. To me they emphasize that there lie immediately ahead times of spectacular change, challenges of revolutionary impact, yet undreamed-of opportunities.

Science and industry are jet propelling this generation into lightning progress of material civilization far outmatching anything mankind has ever known.

Scientists and free enterprisers are making breakthrough in every field.

In electronics alone, you well know how millions of robots are at work for us in our daily lives with computers and pushbutton control systems making it possible to do jobs in factories, offices, and laboratories that before have been too complex or laborious for humans. In television, there are the wonders of transistors and of Telstar spanning the continents, as man learns how to send messages millions of miles along a beam of light.

Our lives will be affected by the peaceful use of atomic energy and new, vaster sources of power by amazing discoveries in chemistry, drugs, and living cells by new uses of metals and other materials and new processes providing us with thousands of new products for you to advertise and sell.

I have just quoted you the forecasts for 13 years from today. Now let's consider the forecasts that this same important report makes for the year 2000.

Here are some of the things that the able economists state will take place in the next 37 years:

The Nation will have 350 million people—almost twice as many as today.

The goods and services produced annually will be almost four times our current gross national product. They will reach \$2,000 billion.

Just imagine what this 2-trillion-a-year

¹ "Projections to the Years 1976 and 2000: Economic Growth, Population, Labor Force and Leisure, and Transportation," reports to Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, to the President and Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

economy will mean in more of all the things for the people who produce, market, and consume the abundance of a fabulous age.

The average family's yearly income—after taxes and in 1959 dollars, mind you—will soar to \$14,750, the survey states.

Fifteen times as many families will be earning \$20,000 a year and up.

I don't for a minute blink at staggering forecasts like these * * * I remember being warned years ago, "Henry, don't be fantastic don't soar into the wild blue yonder," when I urged—let's set our goals for the postwar at 60 million jobs and a 400-billion-a-year economy in the United States. Yet that target has been well exceeded. These forecasts force us to raise our sights.

Spending for housing will triple, the report forecasts.

Five times as much probably will be invested in plant and equipment.

By the turn of this century, we are told we will almost double today's number of jobs. There will be 135 million people gainfully employed.

Their average workweek will be 30 to 31 hours—some 8 hours less than now.

They will have month-long vacations as a rule. They will travel nearly three times as much as now—on the average 11,000 miles a year per person.

Turning to California, I dug into the 434-page book of projections and thought back 15 years ago when skeptics scoffed when I predicted this State's population by 1970 would gain 50 percent and would reach 20 million. I was too conservative. California is headed for 18 million people this year and more than 22 million by 1970. Then what? The forecast is that California in a mere 37 years will have 41 million people.

Now I'm leaving the figures on the magnitude of the growth ahead, and looking to the deeper meanings.

More skills and knowledge than ever before will be called upon in coming years.

The psychologist Walter Pitkin showed that not more than one-fifth of the average man's brain is ever used as it might be, and perhaps half of one's brain remains unused from birth to death. We should not be satisfied with that.

For the future that's right upon us, our youth must be educated to their maximum capacities trained to the skills that will be in serious shortage for this Age of Science. And equally important—they desperately need to be grounded in the humanities—in human relations—and the realms of the spirit.

The jobs ahead call for more ideas and ideals—more courage and will—more zest for work—more brainpower. There always will be still tougher so-called "impossibles." Personally, I occasionally look back on the past only to goad myself to the faith that the pending "impossibles" CAN be done. We should take the "t" out of "can't."

The skeptics said a new cement plant could not make it in northern California which they claimed already had too much capacity. Yet that company's capacity has been multiplied seven times.

Doubting Thomases said the west coast could not mass-produce ships; it didn't have the shipbuilders. Yet ships were built at record low cost at a rate of one a day.

Hardheaded men argued that the west coast had neither the raw materials nor the markets to build its own integrated steel industry. However, a 3-million-ton-a-year steel plant today feeds the industrialization of the West.

Sixteen reasons were given why a newcomer would flop trying to enter the aluminum industry. * * * 200 firms turned down operating the wartime aluminum plants, convinced "aluminum will be running out of our ears." Yet that aluminum business has multiplied nearly six times.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

March 7

B576

Opponents said that they would kill a "New Economics of Medical Care". . . . Yet some 80 hospitals and medical clinics now provide care to 1 million health plan members.

These examples illustrate this credo—find a need and fill it.

At this time of new and unprecedented opportunities, find the needs for tomorrow—to make life fuller, richer, more meaningful, more satisfying to the inner individual.

The revolt is rising to rebuild our huge but decaying, traffic-clogged, nightmarish cities.

Let us resolve that increasing affluence and leisure shall not bring wasteful idleness, heedlessness, and the rot of soft living.

A tremendously greater number of people will engage in a gigantic upsurge of the service businesses and trades. . . . We will spend far more for all the cultural arts. . . .

We seek to create a climate more rewarding to the life of the intellect, the arts, the adventure and learning of travel—all the self-fulfillments of human growth.

Man is discovering through research and science so many ways for people to live longer, and one of the vital ingredients is to keep young at heart.

A towering strength of the American people's free way of life is our system's ability to meet constant changes.

Freedom for Americans means nothing is ever finished.

We are not under dictator rule that we cannot improve ourselves as individuals. The worth and dignity and freedom of the individual are paramount.

The people's right to vote in free elections guarantees the people's veto over the abuse of power and the right to accomplish changes to meet the public will. It is the genius of the people that they have proved they can make democracy work, however fierce are the onslaughts against it.

It is my abiding faith that our system of freedom under law and justice will endure and prevail, both at home and ultimately around the world.

The talent for struggling through and coming up with ever-better solutions should mean, for one thing, that employers and employee unions can find a better way than crippling strikes to arrive at an equitable sharing of the fruits of productivity.

Kaiser Steel employees and management—with the public represented in the program—are experimenting to find better answers to sharing gains of productivity and to cushioning the impact of technological advances.

Our slogan "Together We Build" could be applied to every citizen, because—to live up to our opportunities in this land and win the victory for lasting peace and freedom—require everlasting teamwork.

No people in history have given so much to assist other peoples shake off slavery and poverty in mind, body, and spirit.

I was awakened to how much American free enterprise can do to help other peoples when I flew 75,000 miles on industrial development missions in 1954-55 through Latin America.

We were told all the stock, scare reasons that it couldn't be done. Yet in Argentina and Brazil, there were established full automotive manufacturing industries, employing the people's skills, making nearly all the parts there, raising living standards, earning profits, filling needs.

This is done under the "Partnership Pattern" which is proving itself so much also in other hemispheres.

The grandest achievement that could usher in the 21st century would be that our age should succeed in extending the benefits of civilization to the entire human race.

Win we must—and it's my faith we will win mankind's ceaseless struggle to avert another world war and to attain peace and freedom.

This dip into the future suggests a lot for each and every one of us to do our part.

The world of broadcasting and advertising can carry a powerful message to the people, spurring on the limitless potentials immediately ahead.

The prospects are as limitless as the minds and hearts of men, yet as real as the bold imagination, the faith, the love, and the will to work that men can unleash.

"To be alive in such an age!

With every year a lightning page.
When miracles are everywhere,
And every inch of common air
Throbs a tremendous prophecy
Of greater marvels yet to be.

"To be alive in such an age—

To live in it,
To give to it!

Give thanks with all thy flaming heart—
Crave but to have it in a part."

And may you never underestimate the part you yourself can take. For—

"We never know how high we are.

Till we are called to rise;
And then if we are true to plan,
Our stature touches the skies."

CUBA AND THE PLATT AMENDMENT—OR FORMER PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN SUFFERS A MENTAL LAPSE

(Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, former President Harry S. Truman came forward with a suggested solution to the Cuban crisis which, insofar as it relates to the Platt amendment, would be about as effective as the present administration's handling of this matter.

For clarification of the record, I am herewith including a copy of an article by R. H. Shackford, Scripps-Howard staff writer, on Mr. Truman's proposal in which he points out that the Platt amendment was actually partially repealed in 1934 and a new treaty was substituted on May 29 of that year. I also include a memorandum from the Library of Congress on the subject of the Platt amendment and a copy of the treaty of May 29, 1934, which superseded it, believing it is important to keep the record straight as it relates to Cuba. I am glad to see, however, that the former President did recommend that the Monroe Doctrine should be one of the guiding principles of our actions on Cuba, which is consistent with House Joint Resolution 227, which I introduced calling for the restatement and implementation of the Monroe Doctrine:

"DEAD" PLATT AMENDMENT ON INTERVENTION INVOLVED—MENTAL LAPSE ATTRIBUTED TO TRUMAN ON CUBAN CRISIS

(By R. H. Shackford)

Former President Harry S. Truman, who prides himself as a scholar of American history, had a major lapse last weekend which should leave him blushing.

In a copyrighted newspaper article on the Cuban crisis he suggested that the Platt amendment was still in effect. Actually,

Angela Morgan, "Today."

Emily Dickinson, "Aspiration."

Franklin D. Roosevelt abrogated the Platt amendment in 1934 when he proposed a new treaty with Cuba to supersede the 1903 treaty which included the Platt amendment.

His proposal was ratified by the Senate on June 9, 1934, about 6 months before Mr. Truman became a U.S. Senator.

RIGHTS

The amendment reserved the right of the United States to intervene militarily in Cuba whenever necessary. On May 29, 1934, in asking Senate consent to ratification of a new treaty with Cuba, Mr. Roosevelt said:

"I have publicly declared 'that the definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention.' In this new treaty with Cuba, the contractual right to intervene in Cuba is abolished, and those further rights, likewise granted to the United States in the same instrument, involving participation in the determination of such domestic policies of the Republic of Cuba as those relating to finance and to sanitation, are omitted therefrom.

"By the consummation of this treaty, this Government will make it clear that it not only opposes the policy of armed intervention, but that it renounces those rights of intervention and interference in Cuba."

CARRIED FURTHER

While Mr. Truman was President this renunciation of U.S. intervention was carried further under the Rio Mutual Defense Treaty. In this pact, intervention anywhere in the hemisphere was renounced.

Mr. Truman's apparent forgetfulness of American history showed up in his article after he had cited the various provisions of the Platt amendment. Then he added:

"It seems to me that when it appeared that the situation in Cuba (under Castro) was getting out of hand and that a threat to the security of this hemisphere was clearly in the making, we should have considered that the basic implications of the Monroe Doctrine were at stake, as well as the reservation imposed by the Platt amendment, which anticipated precisely such a move.

"These provisions, the Monroe Doctrine and the Platt amendment, were there as much for the welfare and protection of Cubans as for the security of all the other nations of this continent."

But the Platt amendment was not "there." It has been dead for almost 30 years.

TREATY OF RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CUBA, SIGNED AT WASHINGTON, MAY 29, 1934

(Department of State, Treaty Series, No. 866. The treaty was ratified by the President of the United States, June 5, 1934)

The United States of America and the Republic of Cuba, being animated by the desire to fortify the relations of friendship between the two countries and to modify, with this purpose, the relations established between them by the Treaty of Relations signed at Havana, May 22, 1903, have appointed, with this intention, as their plenipotentiaries:

[Names of plenipotentiaries]

Who, after having communicated to each other their full powers which were found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I

The Treaty of Relations which was concluded between the two contracting parties on May 22, 1903, shall cease to be in force, and is abrogated, from the date on which the present treaty goes into effect.

ARTICLE II

All the acts effected in Cuba by the United States of America during its military occupation of the island, up to May 20, 1902, the date on which the Republic of Cuba was

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

3577

established, have been ratified and held as valid; and all the rights legally acquired by virtue of those acts shall be maintained and protected.

ARTICLE III

Until the two contracting parties agree to the modification or abrogation of the stipulations of the agreement in regard to the lease to the United States of America of lands in Cuba for coaling and naval stations signed by the President of the Republic of Cuba on February 16, 1903, and by the President of the United States of America on the 23d day of the same month and year, the stipulations of that agreement with regard to the naval station of Guantanamo shall continue in effect. The supplementary agreement in regard to naval or coaling stations signed between the two Governments on July 2, 1903, also shall continue in effect in the same form and on the same conditions with respect to the naval station at Guantanamo. So long as the United States of America shall not abandon the said naval station of Guantanamo or the two Governments shall not agree to a modification of its present limits, the station shall continue to have the territorial area that it now has, with the limits that it has on the date of the signature of the present treaty.

ARTICLE IV

If at any time in the future a situation should arise that appears to point to an outbreak of contagious disease in the territory of either of the contracting parties, either of the two Governments shall, for its own protection, and without its act being considered unfriendly, exercise freely and at its discretion the right to suspend communications between those of its ports that it may designate and all or part of the territory of the other party, and for the period that it may consider to be advisable.

ARTICLE V

The present Treaty shall be ratified by the contracting parties in accordance with their respective constitutional methods; and shall go into effect on the date of the exchange of their ratifications, which shall take place in the city of Washington as soon as possible.

In faith whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed their seals hereto.

Done in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, at Washington on the 29th day of May 1934.

[SEAL] CORDELL HULL,
[SEAL] SUMNER WELLES,
[SEAL] M. MARQUEZ STERLING.

THE PLATT AMENDMENT

Following the Spanish-American War, Cuba was occupied by American soldiers until 1902. In 1900, Governor Leonard Wood, acting under orders from Washington, announced an election of an assembly which would draft a constitution for a Cuban government to which the United States would transfer authority. When this assembly was eventually convened, it met with American stipulations. These stipulations, largely drafted by Secretary of War Elihu Root, were introduced in the Senate by Senator Orville H. Platt, of Connecticut, as an amendment to the Army appropriation bill of March 2, 1901, and was adopted by Congress in that form. According to one historian, the Platt amendment "was designed to place such limits upon the island Republic's activities as to make her a safe and tractable neighbor."¹ The amendment authorized the President to terminate the military occupation of Cuba as soon as a Cuban government should have been established under a constitution which "either as a part

thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto," would define future relations with the United States as follows:

1. Cuba should never make any treaty with any foreign power which would impair its independence, nor permit any foreign power to obtain "lodgement or control over any portion of said island."

2. Cuba should agree not to contract any debt beyond the capacity of its ordinary revenues to pay.

3. Cuba should consent that the United States might intervene "for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty," and for the discharging of treaty obligations which would now devolve upon Cuba from the United States.

4. Cuba should ratify all the acts of the U.S. military government.

5. It should agree to execute the sanitary program instituted by the military government.

6. Title to the Isle of Pines (an island south of the western end of Cuba) should be left to future adjustment by treaty with the United States.

7. Cuba should sell or lease to the United States the lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at points to be agreed upon.

8. These provisions should be embodied in a permanent treaty with the United States.

The American demand that these stipulations be included in the Cuban constitution were at first resisted by the constituent assembly, but were eventually accepted after Secretary Root assured the Cubans that the intervention contemplated in the third article would take place only in the event of foreign threat or domestic disturbance. The amendment was added as an annex to the Cuban constitution, and embodied in a permanent treaty between the United States and Cuba in 1903.

OCCASIONS FOR INTERVENTION

The first test for the Platt amendment came in 1903. The first President of Cuba, Estrada Palma, had been reelected, but within a few months there was a revolution. Little fighting actually took place, but Estrada Palma appealed for help to President Theodore Roosevelt. President Roosevelt sent William Howard Taft to Cuba to try to get the quarreling Cuban factions to settle their differences. This mission failed, the President of Cuba then resigned, and the Cuban Congress received his resignation and then adjourned without choosing a successor.

With Cuba thus left without any effective government, Taft proclaimed a provisional regime. President Roosevelt appointed Charles Magoon provisional governor of Cuba. A "handful of soldiers" occupied Cuba, while Magoon strove to carry out various reforms. After reasonably honest election in 1909, the United States withdrew.

In 1911, dissension, riots, and armed uprisings flared again in Cuba. The United States took measures preparatory to intervention. These measures consisted of the dispatch of a few companies of marines to Guantanamo, to aid the established Government in the event anarchy threatened. As events worked out, no greater troop movements were necessary at the time.

Again in 1917, intervention followed on the heels of a disputed election. Declaring that this Government would not recognize a regime established by violence, Secretary of State Lansing urged Cubans to refrain from civil war. Marines were landed to preserve order, and the rebellious faction was

defeated. This was the last direct military intervention by the United States in Cuba.

However, we did subsequently send a financial adviser to Cuba, Gen. Enoch Crowder. In 1922 our Government asked Cuba to recognize our right, under the Platt amendment, to investigate certain departments of the Cuban Government. Despite Cuban protests, Crowder proceeded to carry on such an investigation. Under Crowder's direction the budget was cut, crooked contracts uncovered, and the formation of an "honest cabinet" imposed. This latter step was the U.S. requirement for consent to a loan to Cuba by a New York bank. Crowder left Cuba briefly, returned in 1923 as American Ambassador, and this advisory form of intervention was over.

ABROGATION OF THE AMENDMENT

During the late 1920's and early 1930's the regime of President Gerardo Machado grew steadily more repressive. However, President Hoover's administration in this country refrained from intervention. When the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt assumed office, Sumner Welles was sent as Ambassador to Cuba, as Dr. Julius Pratt wrote, "ostensibly to mediate between Machado and his enemies; really, there is reason to think, to secure Machado's resignation."² In any event, Machado did resign and flee the country on August 12, 1933. Several short-lived regimes followed. The United States eventually recognized the regime of Col. Carlos Mendieta, and in May 1934, negotiated a treaty with his government by which the Platt amendment was abrogated, with the United States reserving only the right to use the naval base at Guantanamo Bay until that right might be set aside by mutual consent. The treaty was signed on May 29, 1934, and approved by the Senate 2 days later without a dissenting vote. According to one source, it represented a growing sensitivity to Latin American opinion, and an attempt on our part to convince Latin America of our good and anti-imperialist intentions.³

Cuba
U.S. TAXPAYERS DOLLARS USED IN CUBAN PRISONER EXCHANGE MARCH 7, 1963

(Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, after a 5-month delay the General Accounting Office has finally answered my inquiry addressed to the Comptroller General on October 9, 1962, relating to the Cuban prisoner blackmail proposals by Castro and the action of the U.S. Government relating thereto.

It appears that contrary to what has been reported to the American people by the Kennedy administration the Government of the United States did participate financially in the Cuban prisoner exchange.

This becomes apparent as a result of the reply I received from Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General, dated March 1.

The Comptroller General's answer, though 5 months late in coming, did reveal "the U.S. Government provided 5

¹ Pratt, Julius W., "A History of U.S. Foreign Policy." New York. Prentice-Hall. 1955. p. 613.

² Thomas, Ann Van Wynen and A. J. Thomas, Jr. "Nonintervention." Dallas. Southern Methodist University Press. 1956. p. 28.

³ Bemis, Samuel Flagg, "A Diplomatic History of the United States." 4th edition. New York. Henry Holt & Co., 1955. p. 506.

¹ Herring, Hubert, "A History of Latin America." New York. Knopf, 1959. p. 404

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

March 7

3578

million pounds of nonfat dried milk solids."

This is in complete contradiction to the President's statement that no U.S. goods were included and that the American taxpayer was not involved in the prisoner exchange.

The Comptroller General reported to me that administrative costs of Government services, such as the use of telephones, transportation and salary and overtime expenses were also incurred.

Not even the Comptroller General could find any authority for these expenses; but, and quoting the Comptroller General:

We do not propose to pursue the matter further.

Campbell wrote me that further supplies of dried milk may be requested by the American Red Cross if it appears that supplies from private contributors is insufficient.

I am hereby protesting any further use of taxpayer's goods for indemnity to Castro and am calling for a full disclosure of this Government's participation in the ransom deal.

Most of my other questions were also answered by the Secretary of State within the context of this letter from the Comptroller General, and those replies are most revealing. I am, therefore, reprinting the letter in full for the information of the Members of the House.

MARCH 1, 1963.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: This is in response to your telegram of October 9, 1962, questioning U.S. participation in the recent negotiations for the release of Cuban prisoners from a policy standpoint as well as from the standpoint of legal authority for using Government funds for such purpose. You raised the following specific questions:

1. How much in U.S.-owned foodstuffs and other things of value are being made available for this purpose?
2. What authority exists for anyone to negotiate for payment in U.S.-owned foodstuffs to Castro and the Communists?
3. What right does Donovan or any other private citizen have to negotiate with Castro and an enemy government?
4. If Donovan is negotiating on behalf of private citizens only, what right does he have under the Logan Act, 18 U.S.C. 953, to do so—let alone a violation of recent policy statement of the Congress? Doesn't his visit to Cuba require Government approval?
5. If Donovan is negotiating in a manner that obligates the U.S. Government to make up the difference between contributions and the \$60 million demanded, is he doing so as an agent of the U.S. Government?
6. Why hasn't a full disclosure of all the facts been made before the deal is closed between Donovan and Castro?

The Secretary of State has reported to us that the release of the prisoners was accomplished by the Cuban Families Committee, a private organization composed of the relatives and friends of the prisoners, assisted by a citizen committee under Gen. Lucius Clay and with the cooperation of private firms and the American Red Cross. The Secretary stated that Mr. James B. Donovan was the principal negotiator for the committee and that the main role of the U.S. Government was to insure that the private effort was not hampered by procedural problems within the Government and to expedite and coordinate the governmental and private aspects of the effort. In answer to the specific questions

which you raised there is presented below the information which the Secretary of State furnished us and our comments thereon:

"1. The U.S. Government has provided 5 million pounds of nonfat dried milk solids from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks through the American Red Cross upon the latter's request under general statutory authority (7 U.S.C. 1431) providing for donations to needy peoples, in order to fill any gap that may exist in private donations of goods for the exchange. Representatives of the American Red Cross and the Cuban Red Cross will supervise distribution of the milk in Cuba to insure that it will reach children and other needy persons. The Red Cross has indicated that the Cuban Families Committee expects to raise funds to reimburse the Department of Agriculture. Further supplies of dried milk may be requested by the American Red Cross if it appears that the baby food obtainable from private contributors is insufficient to complete the shipment of goods for the Cuban prisoners' exchange and the Department of Agriculture is prepared to make additional quantities available on such request. The terms of that Department's action were described in its release of January 8, 1963.

"Other than the commitment of dried milk from the surplus stocks of the Department of Agriculture, no U.S. Government funds were used in the prisoner exchange project save for minor administrative costs of Government services, such as use of telephones, some transportation, and some salary and overtime expense. The Government hopes to recover the cost of these services. No unvouchered funds have been used at any time. No tax rulings were issued to contributing companies which were not clearly authorized or required by law or governing court decisions."

Section 1431 of title 7, United States Code, provides, in part, that:

"In order to prevent the waste of commodities whether in private stocks or acquired through price-support operations by the Commodity Credit Corporation before they can be disposed of in normal domestic channels without impairment of the price-support program or sold abroad at competitive world prices, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized, on such terms and under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem in the public interest: . . . (4) to donate any such food commodities in excess of anticipated disposition under clauses (1), (2), and (3) above to non-profit voluntary agencies registered with the Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the Foreign Operations Administration or other appropriate department or agency of the Federal Government and intergovernmental organizations for use in the assistance of needy persons outside the United States . . ."

There does not appear to be any question but that the donation as described by the Secretary of State of nonfat dried milk solids through the Red Cross to needy persons in Cuba is, policy considerations aside, authorized under the quoted statutory provisions. However, we could not find any authority for incurring telephone, transportation, salary, and overtime expenses to the extent that such expenses were not related to the donation under section 1431, above. The Department of State reports that such expenditures were nominal; therefore, in view of the time and effort which undoubtedly would be required to isolate the costs involved and since the violations are clearly of a nonrecurring nature, we do not propose to pursue the matter further.

"2-3. The Cuban Families Committee, which was organized in June 1961, continued the negotiations with Cuban officials for exchange of the prisoners which were begun by the Tractors-for-Freedom Committee in

May 1961. The President stated the following on May 24, 1961, in support of the tractors-for-freedom movement:

"The U.S. Government has not been and cannot be a party to these negotiations. But when private citizens seek to help prevent suffering in other lands through voluntary contributions—which is a great American tradition—this Government should not interfere with their humanitarian efforts.

"Neither law nor equity calls upon us to impose obstacles in their path as they seek to save those who fought to restore freedom in our hemisphere. I am advised that the Logan Act is not involved, . . . that tax exemption is granted as a matter of course to any charitable organizations engaged in the rehabilitation and assistance of needy refugees; and that export licenses are routinely granted for humanitarian reasons, to ship farm produce and medicines to Cuba."

"The views of the President in regard to the tractors-for-freedom movement may be applied as well to the efforts of the Cuban Families Committee. With regard to the latter the President restated the position that the U.S. Government could not be a party to negotiations for this purpose. However, he has stated on more than one occasion his sympathy with the efforts of the Cuban Families Committee to obtain the prisoners' release.

"No U.S. official participated in Mr. James B. Donovan's discussions with Cuban officials of the terms and arrangements for exchange of the invasion prisoners. The U.S. Government was not represented in any way at these meetings.

"4. Permission to visit Cuba was granted Mr. Donovan by the Department of State in view of his humanitarian mission. The Logan Act, 18 U.S.C. 953, is not in question since Mr. Donovan's discussions with Cuban officials were not 'in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States or to defeat the measures of the United States.'

"Further, the U.S. embargo on trade with Cuba was not circumvented by the terms of the prisoners' exchange since the embargo provisions excepted most foodstuffs, medicines and medical supplies, and almost all of the products pledged in the prisoners' exchange are items that are currently permitted to be shipped to Cuba under general license. Some items involved in the prisoners' exchange do require individual validated licenses under existing export control regulations. These are chiefly foodstuffs, medicinals, pesticides for household and agricultural purposes, and medical equipment, which would help to fill an evident need of the Cuban people but not otherwise aid the Cuban economy. However, offers to donate insecticides valued at approximately \$2 million and suitable for use on sugar crops—Cuba's primary export commodity—have been rejected even though Cuba does not use insecticides on its sugar crops.

"Further, the total amount and nature of the goods involved in the transaction do not constitute any significant or lasting benefit to the political position of the Castro regime in Cuba. The major item in the transaction is pharmaceuticals (approximately \$24 million). Cuba used to consume about \$85 to \$100 million of pharmaceuticals annually, of which over \$60 million was imported. Therefore, the pharmaceuticals to be supplied constitute less than 6 months' normal imports. The Castro government had budgeted approximately \$1 million in foreign exchange for the importation of pharmaceuticals—consequently, the delivery of pharmaceuticals to Cuba will release only this comparatively small amount of foreign exchange."

The Logan Act provides, in pertinent part, that "Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or

1963

intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or agency or officer thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years or both."

This provision of law, in that it contains fine and imprisonment terms, is criminal in nature and not within the purview of the General Accounting Office to enforce. Responsibility for application of the Logan Act lies with the Department of Justice.

"5. The U.S. Government was in no way committed by Mr. Donovan's agreement with Cuban officials, and Mr. Donovan had no authority to commit the United States during his discussions in Habana.

"The final terms of the prisoner exchange agreement reached as a result of Mr. Donovan's efforts call for the delivery by July 1, 1963 of \$53 million worth of goods, c.i.f. Habana. Cuban officials accepted 15 percent as the calculation for charges of handling freight and insurance which is to be included in the \$53 million total. The wholesale value of the goods eventually to be delivered is therefore estimated at approximately \$46 million. In addition, before the transaction could be consummated, the fines for the 60 wounded prisoners who were released on credit in April 1962 had to be paid in cash by the Cuban Families Committee. The amount of the fines, totaling \$2,925,000, was raised primarily by Gen. Lucius Clay on behalf of the committee entirely from private sources.

"6. A full disclosure of the facts concerning the Cuban invasion prisoner transaction could not be made by the U.S. Government before agreement was reached (1) because the U.S. Government was not a party to the negotiations; (2) while the negotiations were still in progress, it was not known what the final terms of the exchange arrangements might be, or how soon the negotiations would be successfully terminated, if at all; (3) it was not possible to say before the terms were agreed upon whether the private committee planned to request U.S. Government assistance in meeting these terms; (4) premature disclosure of information available to this Government would have constituted U.S. Government intervention in the matter and might have prejudiced the negotiations.

"The position of the U.S. Government toward the prisoner exchange has been fully and currently reported in the press, except during the period in which there was a hazard that publicity might endanger the safety of the prisoners. Attention can be called to the extensive and generally accurate reports printed immediately after the exchange in the Washington Evening Star of December 24, the Washington Post of December 25, and the New York Times News Service of December 26, 1962."

In summary, it appears, aside from the nominal administrative costs that may have been involved, that the entire transaction so far as the Government's interest was concerned involves matters of policy and the applicability of criminal statutes within the jurisdiction of the Executive Branch of the Government to determine. Regarding the provisions of the Trading with the Enemy Act, 50 U.S.C. App. 1-39, and Presidential Proclamation 3447 of February 3, 1962, 27 F.R. 1085, declaring an embargo on all trade with Cuba, it should be noted that provisions are made in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Proclamation for the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce to make exceptions to the restrictions on imports from and exports to Cuba. In view of all of the facts and circumstances as disclosed by the report of the Secretary of State and since the essential basis for controversy over the transaction as finally consummated

lies in the realm of policy and statutory considerations outside the scope of the jurisdiction of this Office, we do not propose to take any action in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

THE 1963 LINCOLN BANQUET

(Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of February 5, 1963, the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia again sponsored their annual Lincoln banquet in observance of the birth of our most American American, Abraham Lincoln. This year it was held at the National Press Club. Some 150 avid, interested, and recognized students of Lincoln were present to enjoy the occasion and to learn more about the life and work of this great American.

The president of the group is Dr. Paul Gantt who pointed out that there was reason for us to commemorate the anniversary of Lincoln's birth on the 5th of February rather than the 12th as is our custom when it can be arranged. He pointed out some of Lincoln's activities on February 5 which included the following:

February 5, 1861, while still in Springfield, Ill., Lincoln visited with Horace Greeley.

February 5, 1862, Lincoln received his salary warrant of \$2,083.33. Mrs. Lincoln gave an unprecedented White House ball and 633 people filled the East Room.

February 5, 1863, he again received a salary warrant, this time amounting to \$2,022.33. On the same day he wrote to Gen. Franz Sigel:

General Schurz thinks I was a little cross in my late note to you. If I was, I ask pardon. If I do get up a little temper I have no sufficient time to keep it up.

February 5, 1864, he again received a salary warrant of \$2,022.33. On the same day he wrote to Secretary Edwin M. Stanton:

On principle I dislike an oath which requires a man to swear he has not done wrong. It rejects the Christian principle of forgiveness on terms of repentance. I think it is enough if the man does no wrong thereafter.

February 5, 1865, at 7 p.m., the President read to the Cabinet a proposal to pay \$400 million to 16 States pro rata on their slave population in return to cessation of all resistance to national authority by April 1, 1865.

The "Lincoln Day by Day" book tersely notes:

Cabinet unanimously disapproves.

After these remarks he extended the greetings of the group, paid tribute to the committee, and then introduced the master of ceremonies for the occasion, Mr. Eldon Billings, the vice president of the Lincoln group, a student of history, an authority on Lincoln, and a very capable economist at the Library of Congress. His background and capabilities

fit very well the opportunity he was given to be master of ceremonies. He performed this task with tact, appropriateness, and dignity.

The group heard the Singing Sergeants give several renditions which were interesting and appropriate. Again we were reminded of the great talent and sense of dedication that the young men in our armed services have and were impressed once more with the ability of our leaders to bring out and display in a very fine manner the talents that are present among those who serve us in our Defense Establishments. They were given a generous hand and were appreciated beyond measure by all who heard them.

One of the features of the banquet each year is the announcement and presentation of the Lincoln Award of the Year to someone who, in the opinion of the awards committee of the Lincoln group, has through the years made contributions in the general area of Lincolniana. This year we were pleased to honor a man who was most deserving of this recognition—Ralph Geoffrey Newman—for 30 years of unselfish devotion to the Lincoln story, and those who tell it. Servant, student seeker, scholar, discoverer and discernor, propagator and expositor, counselor and critic and comrade, editor, writer, collaborator, publisher, often fastidiously anonymous, always the happy, the generous participant, formulator, fashioner and founder of tables round, bookman rare and bibliographer learned, acknowledged authority and changeless, exuberant, eager amateur, friend to the Lincoln men, preceptor of the past for the enlightenment of the present.

SPEAKERS

As is our custom, we again had outstanding speakers who talked from both great knowledge and feeling for the heritage of our country as reflected in the life and work of this noble citizen in our heritage.

This being the 100th anniversary of the Proclamation of Emancipation, it was natural that Carl Haverlin, last year's winner of the Lincoln Award, should talk on the Proclamation of Emancipation. Because what he said is so meaningful and is worthwhile for us to know about as we contend with the complex problems of this age, I am asking that this be placed in the Record so that every Member of Congress and all who receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have the opportunity of reading this splendid dissertation in which he points up the salient fact that Lincoln regarded our kind of democracy as "the last best hope of earth." And, because Lincoln had such strong feelings about this he was moved to issue the Emancipation Proclamation at a time when it could be implemented and in a way that made it legal. In pointing out its many ramifications and great impact he quotes Dr. John Hope Franklin, who was our principal speaker 2 years ago when he said:

The ramifications as well as the implications of the Emancipation Proclamation seem endless.

When we think of this great state paper we are aware that this, as is true with so many things in our heritage, had an impact that went far beyond the immediate objective. And, we are reminded again, as we should often be, of the importance of applying the lessons that we have learned in history to our present day problems. Mr. Speaker, this speech by Mr. Haverlin was indeed a great contribution to the Lincoln story and it is worthy of our study and consideration today.

The second speaker on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, was a colleague of ours, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative PAUL FINDLEY, who represents the district in which Lincoln lived so long and where he made preparation for the statesmanship that he later displayed so eloquently as President of the United States. PAUL FINDLEY not only represents the Lincoln district but he also lives in Pittsfield, Ill., the home town of John G. Nicolay, one of Lincoln's confidants and secretaries during that critical period in our Nation's history. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], spoke of the fact that Nicolay had so many advantages that no other man in that time had and that is because he was privileged to be present when Lincoln brought forth so many ennobling, uplifting and moving statements that helped to shape the direction and destiny of our system and form of government and which did so much to not only preserve but to promote the great ideals that were a major part of the thinking and action of our earlier patriots who Lincoln honored and respected so much. The splendid speech given by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], was the result, I am sure, of much research and study and because it reveals Lincoln through one of his secretaries and through a distinguished and able Representative from Illinois 100 years later, I take great pleasure in placing it in the Record with the hope that what this young man said on that occasion will be read and thought on by many people today and in the future. The speeches follow:

CARL HAVERLIN'S TALK BEFORE LINCOLN GROUP OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, FEBRUARY 5, 1963

To know what this Nation stands for, and not just what it stands against, the world need not look beyond our wholehearted observances of the centenary of the Emancipation Proclamation. With Magna Carta and our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution, the proclamation stands with the imperishable capstones of liberty.

By their very nature, they are profoundly moving documents, and meaningful to all men everywhere, regardless of color. Whether we be descendant of slaves, descendant of their masters, or of those who detested or those who condoned slavery, all mankind is the fortunate legatee of the proclamation.

For as Lincoln said so logically in his second annual message to Congress, "In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike, in what we give and what we receive."

Abraham Lincoln has been called throughout the world the most beloved American. Other peoples throughout the world have affection and respect for him as deep as our own. He stirs their emotions not only be-

cause he freed the slaves, but because he was ever a mighty spokesman for people like themselves and for democracy. Our example has made it clear to them that the placement of the concerns of the citizen above the concerns of the state is the veritable foundation of a democracy. They know that we hold the sole purpose of the state is to guarantee and preserve inviolate the existence of the individual.

Lincoln often expressed his faith not only in our democracy, but in the ultimate power of the individual citizen, but never more explicitly than in his first inaugural address. In it he asked, "Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?"

He regarded democracy as "the last best hope of earth" and termed it that form of government which promised "that in due time the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men." He coupled his antagonism to slavery with his fervor for popular government. While he held slavery to be a monstrous injustice in itself, he hated it even more because, he said, "it enables the enemies of free institutions, with plausibility, to taunt us as hypocrites."

In his preliminary Emancipation Proclamation he promised that 100 days thereafter the slaves in the States then still in rebellion against the Federal Government "shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free."

On the hundredth day, January 1, 1863, that promise was fulfilled insofar as the power of the Presidency could fulfill it; but in the final proclamation the moving phrase of freedom rang—"are, and henceforward shall be free."

However, the dual proclamations were but the first two notes of a major triad. The cadence of freedom was resolved in December, 1865, with the 13th amendment was adopted and the slaves were guaranteed their freedom under constitutional law.

For the sake of our domestic conscience and our repute abroad, it is sad that I cannot go on to say that the newly enfranchised came at once into the full sunlight of all their civil liberties. But in the face of history, we must acknowledge our human imperfections, past and present. We must admit that the new laws, by themselves, could no more lead to full freedom than the old laws, which they replaced, could made for total slavery.

Though the proclamations and succeeding legislation did bestow freedom on the slave, the grant was not everywhere complete—for beyond the power of the law was the power of prejudice. Although the law could set the Negro free, there was no law that could free a man from prejudice. Its cruel shackles can be unlocked only with the keys of understanding and compassion—and those two keys lie buried deep within the minds of the prejudiced.

It is cold comfort for us to reflect that the struggle for human rights which still agitates this Nation is not unique to us nor to the century just concluded.

Rare and blessed is that country which can affirm it has not been and is not so troubled. Since the dawn of history, minorities have been forced to eat the bitter fruit of prejudice; and those of good will among the majorities who have been unable to make it sweet for the few have found this failure equally bitter.

Though, admittedly, we have not achieved completely all our objectives for all our citizens, the world knows our vast majority has tried earnestly to achieve the long-set goals. Most important, it knows that we shall never cease in our efforts until they are reached—for this is the popular will.

In preparing my thoughts for this address, I had before me a copy of John Hope Franklin's "The Emancipation Proclamation." The Lincoln Group may take pride in the fact

that the chapter which nobly resolves the book, "Victory More Certain," is the address delivered before this organization by Dr. Franklin on the 11th of February, 1961.

I commend his book to you. In a forthcoming review, Bruce Catton terms it "a scholarly and thoughtful examination of a great state paper." I believe it to be the finest exposition of the Emancipation Proclamation yet published.

While reading Dr. Franklin's preface I came up this sentence: "The ramifications as well as the implications of the Emancipation Proclamation seem endless, and many of them have doubtless escaped me." Reading his book with this point before me led inevitably to a theory which I propose for the consideration of Dr. Franklin and other historians.

We are now in the second century since the Emancipation Proclamation. For 100 years its friends and its enemies have considered it a military necessity. But was that Proclamation issued only as a war measure? Was it only the superficial expression of an indeterminate military necessity? Indeed how heavy was the weight of the military need for emancipation? How compelling was congressional pressure upon the President? Were these two elements the primary forces that impelled him on September 22 and January 1?

Or had the heat of war and the chill of defeats weakened the bulwarks of slavery as the weathering years soften the stones in old gardens, letting seeds and roots long buried and restrained send out their tendrils to the sun?

Was the proclamation, in short, imposed by the Commander-in-Chief of the military forces wholly as a strategic device that would at once weaken the enemy and quiet the radical Congressmen?

Or, on the contrary, as I shall propose, did not Abraham Lincoln, remembering his long thoughts about slavery and sensing the convictions of the humane majorities in both the North and South, take advantage of the situation to render justice to the slave, lift a burden from his master, and cleanse the consciences of all? If these suggestions have merit, then the emancipation's military significance would have been of secondary importance to him.

I hope these considerations will bring us closer to the solution of what I believe to be the underlying mystery of the emancipation proclamations.

Although the two proclamations are themselves in evidence, the open facts about them are unchallenged, and the testimony of the principles is before us, nevertheless in my opinion, the motivation of the President is not yet entirely clear.

Over the years, and indeed to this very day, cynical men have sought to minimize the import of emancipation. They have quoted with relish, from the overt evidence, to prove to their satisfaction that slavery was either embraced or tolerated by a careless people and a callous President until a transcending fear rather than a transcending sympathy for human misery and respect for human dignity caused its abolition. That fear? The fear of military defeat.

I have heard men sneer at Lincoln on these same grounds and call him a hypocrite. In fact, within the week an acquaintance, learning that I would speak here, offered to supply my text:

"The Devil was sick—the Devil a monk would be."

"The Devil was well—the Devil a monk was he."

I have said I think there is a mystery surrounding the two proclamations. It is this: I cannot find the voice of Lincoln the poet in either of them, though I have every reason to expect it since his great gift of lyric utterance, in matters that stirred him, shines out from so many other state papers. Not

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1243

won't wash away the loose pieces of soil and other things on top of the ground.

That's why water that flows fast will wash or erode land more than water that flows slowly. If the water runs fast, it will carry more soil with it.

The amount of soil that will be washed away in a given time will depend also on how easily the soil will erode.

For example, water may be flowing over two different kinds of soil at the same rate, at the same depth and for the same length of time. Yet one soil will wash away much faster than the other. This is because the two soils differ in their ability to resist erosion.

Twenty-two percent of Johnson County's 390,400 acres are considered by soil experts to be susceptible to excessive erosion, 26 percent susceptible to severe erosion and 52 percent to moderate erosion.

The result of a drop of water falling on bare soil somewhat resembles the action of an exploding bomb. Each raindrop digs a small hole in the ground surface. The loosened soil can then be easily washed away if the water is not held where it falls.

Basically, the process of soil erosion by water consists of three principal steps: (1) loosening soil particles by the impact of raindrops or by the scouring action of runoff, (2) moving the detached particles by flowing water, and (3) depositing the particles at new locations. In a watershed, these steps occur in sequence from ridge to river or stream.

Whenever the rain falls faster than it can soak in, a sheet of water collects on the surface and moves downhill.

The rain continues to dislodge soil and keep it suspended in the moving sheet or feed it into the little streams of water flowing off the field along crop rows or hills. Mineral nutrients and organic matter are churned into the runoff and carried away, leaving the coarser, less fertile particles behind.

The combined actions of beating rain and flowing water remove continuous layers of soil from fields. This is sheet erosion.

On rolling land, soil is removed more rapidly from the hilltops and steep slopes than from the gentle ones lower down, often exposing lighter colored subsoil as erosion progresses. But sheet erosion takes place wherever muddy water moves off a field during a rain without ponding.

If the water in the little streams moves fast enough, it, too, dislodges soil and carries it along with that splashed up by the raindrops. This scouring action carves out channels that join farther down the slope. This is rill erosion.

The little streams or rills carry more soil as they pick up speed or grow in size. The abrasive particles they carry help scour the sides and bottoms of the channels. Sheet and rill erosion in combination remove enormous amounts of soil from unprotected fields.

Further cultivation smooths the rills and mixes subsoil with the surface layer. The result in most soils is a surface layer harder to work and less productive than the original one.

As the rills join to make larger channels, the runoff becomes more and more concentrated as it moves downslope and its scouring action increases.

A sudden drop, or overfall, in the channel multiplies the cutting power of the stream and enlarges the channel as the overfall advances upstream.

The result: gullies. They are channels so deep they cannot be smoothed out by ordinary cultivation. Soil conservation officials say gullies in Johnson County are feeding large amounts of sediment into the county's streams, the Iowa River and the Coralville Reservoir.

Gullies often are a sign that sheet and

rill erosion have been going on a long time. Sometimes they divide fields into small areas impractical to cultivate, even where erosion is not serious between the gullies.

The banks of some large gullies slump and cave. This is especially likely to happen if the soil is underlain by a deep crumbly material. As the plunging stream of water undercuts the head and sides of the gully, great masses of soil break loose and are swept downstream.

In this way gullies advance rapidly across some fields and often make otherwise productive land impossible to farm.

When erosion is active on the uplands of a watershed, the stream that drains the watershed may be cutting away its banks, also. This usually is the result of more floodwaters than normal from the unprotected watershed and the scouring action of the sediment load in the stream.

The final step in the erosion process is the depositing of the soil particles that have been moved. This sediment deposit may occur in upland fields or on bottom lands where it damages crops.

Or the sediment may fill streams, ponds, and reservoirs. In any event, deposition of the soil where it is not wanted may be as damaging as its removal from its original position on the watershed.

The Administration's Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter addressed to me as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., March 5, 1963.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I know that you and the members of your Committee on Finance will be interested in the fact that the federation recently concluded a poll of its more than 190,000 individual members in the smaller independent business and independent professional pursuits on the subject of the tax reduction phase of the administration's program.

In thousands of signed ballots sent to their Congressmen in the House of Representatives a majority of these members voted in favor of the three-stage reduction in personal and corporation income taxes, also in favor of the administration's proposal to reduce personal income taxes by various percentages, also to reduce corporation tax rates to 22 percent on the first \$25,000 of taxable income and 47 percent on all above that figure. Additionally a slightly larger majority voted in favor of the corporation rate revision proposal by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, ranking minority member of the Senate Small Business Committee to

reduce corporation tax rate to 22 percent of the first \$50,000 taxable income leaving the rate at 52 percent above that figure.

It is most significant to note that while a majority of federation members voted across the board in favor of the administration's tax revision proposals an even greater majority stated they favored Congress matching tax cuts with Federal spending cuts on a dollar-for-dollar basis. In other words, Senator BYRD, there is a definite consensus among our members for reductions in Government spending to accompany tax cuts.

For your further information I set forth below the questions asked our members, with the percentage response received:

(In percent)

	For	Against	No vote
1. President's proposal for 3-stage tax cut.....	66	29	5
2. President's proposal to reduce personal income taxes.....	70	26	4
3. President's proposal to reduce corporate income taxes.....	53	40	7
4. Senate Small Business Committee plan to cut corporate taxes.....	59	34	7
5. Congress match tax cuts by spending cuts.....	83	14	3

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Administration Not Blazing New Trail
With Tax TheoryEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, editorial interest in tax reform is currently running high, stimulated by the President's recommendations to the Congress. It was inevitable, though, that attention would be directed to alternatives to the proposals now before us, or to modifications aimed at more workable methods of stimulating the economy—the President's announced aim. I submit for the consideration of my colleagues, as an indication of such editorial reaction in the Sixth District of Michigan, an editorial from the Flint Journal of February 26, 1963, which makes some interesting points in favor of the principle we have had before us these many years in the Herlong-Baker bill.

The article follows:

ADMINISTRATION NOT BLAZING NEW TRAIL
WITH TAX THEORY

Backers of President Kennedy's tax recommendations to Congress sometimes get carried away. They imply that the theory on which the revisions are based is a novel idea stemming from the New Frontier. This is not true.

The theory, of course, is that a lower rate of taxes eventually will produce more money from a greatly expanded national economy.

In subscribing to such a theory Mr. Kennedy is neither propounding something new nor blazing a new trail in the implementation of an old doctrine.

The principle is as old as taxation itself. It is what is known as the law of diminish-

A1244

March 7

ing returns which decrees that after a tax passes the maximum level of toleration any further increase in the rate produces less rather than more revenue because it damages the source.

In reverse application, a lower rate of taxation—down to a given point—eventually produces more revenue because it makes possible the creation of more substance to tax.

This is more than a theory. It has been demonstrated in actual application of the Federal income tax.

The Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer recently pointed out that Andrew W. Mellon, secretary of the Treasury under three Presidents—Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover—sold the idea of a rate reduction to a skeptical Congress. He argued that a rate reduction actually would yield more revenue in time than the rates in force because the incentives would create so much more income to tax.

Congress went along with Mellon and experience proved him right. But the theory hasn't been applied in a substantial way since Mellon's day.

This doesn't mean that the idea was swept under the bed and forgotten until now. But those who have been advancing the same arguments Mellon used haven't been listened to in recent years. Now the Kennedy administration is trying to take credit for coming up with a startling new idea.

One group which has been pushing for such tax action for at least 5 years is the handful of Congressmen supporting the Herlong-Baker bill, aimed at lessening the tax obstacles to economic growth. That's how long attempts have been made to get the proposed legislation to the action stage.

In making his tax recommendation, the President accepted the principle on which the Herlong-Baker bill is based. However, he stopped short of the full implementation called for in the bill sponsored by Representative A. S. Herlong, Democrat, of Florida, and Representative HOWARD W. BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee.

For one thing, the administration plan would apply more tax reduction more abruptly—3 years as against 5 years, a \$4 billion first-year reduction as against one of just under \$4 billion. For another, the Kennedy goal is shorter—an eventual reduction of \$10 billion as against one of slightly more than \$10 billion.

For another, the President's program puts less emphasis on economic stimulation through the encouragement of investment by keeping both the corporate and individual top brackets much higher.

Also, although Mr. Kennedy has promised to curtail nondefense spending, it seems inevitable that enactment of his plan as submitted would result in an even larger budget deficit, at least in the beginning. The Herlong-Baker bill contains a suspension provision to guard against deficit increases.

Because of the political implications, it is unlikely that either the administration or Congress will endorse in its entirety a bill which has the backing of the business world—which Herlong-Baker has. But the President's latest proposal agrees in principle with the bill (as compared with his recommendation to Congress last year). And it seems not too much to hope that sufficient modifications can be worked out and a program formulated that will overcome the weaknesses of the administration plan and be acceptable to those who believe in fiscal regularity.

As the sponsors of the Herlong-Baker bill pointed out after Mr. Kennedy's recommendation was made, it is not important whose name is on the bill finally adopted or whether it is a combination of several bills.

The goal of more growth and jobs through spaced-out rate reform, while strengthening the Federal budgetary situation, is our overriding concern.

We Handle Khrushchev With Kid Gloves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the amazing story of our refusal to make U-2 flights, last fall, could have been disastrous. We were quite lucky, as it turned out.

President Kennedy, in his program of being blunt with our friends and soft on our enemies, was the one responsible for the failure to use our full intelligence facilities during the period, last fall.

In yesterday's Washington Evening Star, Jules Witcover tells us about the photo-gap:

CUBAN PHOTO GAP TIED TO FEAR OF U-2 RUCKUS

(By Jules Witcover)

Fear of another international U-2 incident appears to have been the major impediment to earlier discovery of the Soviet missile buildup in Cuba.

The Kennedy administration was deeply concerned that heavier aerial reconnaissance of the island might erupt into a replay of the U-2 propaganda brawl that scuttled the summit conference in May 1960.

Every evidence, both public and private, tends to support the conclusion that for 5 weeks, high-altitude flights were avoided over areas where the Russians were preparing to build offensive sites, for fear that loss of a U-2 would ignite another diplomatic uproar.

The fear apparently was based not so much on the possibility of a diplomatic setback in the court of world opinion. Rather, it grew out of concern that the bold Soviet gambit might be obscured in a sea of semantics and shifted to the United Nations before conclusive proof could be obtained.

MISSILE THREAT TO U-2'S

Discovery of Soviet surface-to-air missiles by a U-2 on August 29 posed an immediate threat to overflying U-2's, and the shooting down of a Nationalist China U-2 over Red China on September 9 confirmed the surface-to-air missiles' capability.

It is believed now that the U.S. policymakers were sufficiently concerned by the downing of the Chinese U-2 that they stopped all U-2 overflights of Cuba for nearly a week while that incident could be appraised in the light of the Cuban situation.

Finally, it apparently was decided that flights should be resumed, but not over areas protected by the surface-to-air missile sites. Thus, Defense Secretary McNamara was able to report only last week that flights were made four times during the 5-week period of the so-called photo gap and that pictures were taken, but that they didn't relate to the Soviet offensive buildup.

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

What appears to have happened then was this:

1. A U-2 flight was made for the first time in 12 days on September 17, but cloud cover prevented effective phototaking.

2. Other U-2 flights were made on September 26, 29, October 5 and 7, but they flew patterns that avoided the surface-to-air missile sites and hence yielded pictures of Cuba that were unrelated to buildup, since the protective surface-to-air missile sites were constructed in the buildup areas.

3. In response to a number of developments—more provocative refugee intelligence, the pressures of leading members of

the intelligence community, an increasing clamor from Capitol Hill—the President around October 9 and 10 ordered U-2's to photograph the surface-to-air missile-protected areas.

4. It was here that the discussion took place that led to transfer of overflight responsibility from the Central Intelligence Agency to the Strategic Air Command of the Air Force. In itself this discussion did not cost time, because bad weather would have prevented flights for these few days anyway.

5. SAC was given flight responsibility on October 12 or 13, ostensibly because it had more planes but probably also because of the military implications of potential attacks from the surface-to-air missiles.

6. The President authorized a SAC U-2 overflight for October 14 on a specially preplanned flight pattern taking it directly over the San Cristobal area protected by surface-to-air missiles. The flight yielded the telltale photo of the Soviet offensive buildup well underway. From then on, overflights were stepped up regardless of the surface-to-air missile threat.

STATEMENTS BACK OUTLINE

This chronology of the 5-week "photo gap" period is reinforced by several public statements by high administration officials and a number of private sources in and out of the administration.

John Hughes, the Defense Intelligence Agency expert who brief the Nation in the February 6 televised report on Cuba, set August 29 as the date on which high-altitude photos provided the first evidence of Soviet surface-to-air deployment in Cuba.

It was this information, magnified by the downing of a Chinese U-2, that is believed to have accentuated deep concern within the administration about the possibilities of a diplomatic or propaganda short circuit of the intelligence effort.

A high administration official, discussing the mood of the decision-makers sometime later, emphasized the extreme caution with which the administration approached the matter of sending U-2's over Cuba.

He recounted the propaganda mess that accrued from the downing of Francis Gary Powers' plane over the Soviet Union on May 1, 1960, and emphasized that the memory of this affair was in the minds of key administration advisers throughout this time.

Accordingly, he said the administration proceeded with great care against the chance that a plane might be shot down, causing the loss of U.S. psychological initiative as well as loss of the plane.

The Administration's Civil Rights Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State and the Columbia Record of March 3, 1963, contains an excellent editorial which presents some good food for thought to those supporting the so-called civil rights proposal which would substitute a sixth-grade education for vote of qualification tests in the States. This editorial points up the fact that such legislation would water down rather than improve the quality of the ballot in the United States. I commend these edi-

1963

being is suffering, there is Christ likewise suffering?

2. Am I antagonistic when a person of another color joins my parish, sits in my pew, attends my church society, or kneels next to me at the altar rail? According to his or her reliability and devotion, am I glad to have a person of a different race on my vestry or hold a parish office?

3. In my daily work, am I willing to labor side by side in union jobs, in office posts in any kind of honest employment with decent people regardless of race or religion? Am I willing to be helpful to such persons, cooperative and understanding and to conduct myself in the spirit of Christ and the Constitution of the United States? If I am an employer, am I willing to hire those of different races when they are qualified for positions and are willing to give of their best abilities? Am I doing my best to end economic discrimination so that our free enterprise system will remain free for every willing worker? Do I want full employment for all sorts and conditions of men as long as they are honest, reliable, and industrious?

4. Am I too hard of heart to have a sense of shame when I drive through blighted areas, overcrowded slums, filthy, and deteriorated living quarters? Does my heart go out to the needs of the children and the delinquency that follows from such living conditions? Am I moved to help improve these conditions or do I simply "pass by on the other side" without care or action?

5. When people of other races move into my neighborhood, am I courteous to them or do I seek ways of preventing their presence?

6. Do I seek special privilege, regardless of my race or religion, when I lack dependability, courteous manners, and sincere willingness to work and search for truth and sound learning?

7. Am I provincial, unwilling to study the world conflicts now being fought along lines of racial and religious hatred? Have I tried to understand the consequences of spiritual blindness in racial antagonisms?

My friends, few of us will find ourselves without guilt on one or many of these questions. May we approach them with calm understanding, spiritual insight, persistent prayer, and openness of mind. May those of us who feel strongly on one side or the other of these questions, ask God to rid us of the self-righteousness that breeds a haughty air of intolerance. May we approach this issue of the hour with intellectual integrity, emotional discipline, Christ-like humility, and patriotic devotion. May we not judge some other part of the world or nation without first examining our own consciences in the community in which we now live.

Faithfully yours in Christ,

AUSTIN PARDUE,
Bishop of Pittsburgh.

No Propaganda Ministry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Rushville (Ind.) Daily Republican, issue of March 4:

NO PROPAGANDA MINISTRY

Management of the news is a growing practice in the United States. It shows up on all levels. But nowhere has it reached

the proportions now being disclosed in Washington.

Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, actually boasted of the way the administration had carefully timed releases to news media to produce the proper effect in the Cuban crisis. For a top administration official to declare that news is a weapon must give the free world the shudders.

Then came a directive by Sylvester to all of the Defense Department's military and civilian personnel to report to him the substance of every interview or telephone conversation with a newsmen. A similar order has been put into effect by the State Department. In plain words, officials are being told not to talk to reporters.

Most disturbing is the attitude on the part of top U.S. officials that these developments reveal. They are saying that the only news American citizens should receive is that in governmental handouts. It would be easy to extend this to matters not involving U.S. security. The next step is telling selected untruths to influence public opinion.

This is a situation about which all Americans should be concerned, regardless of their political or ideological beliefs.

Employment-of-the-Handicapped Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of the two prize-winning essays in the employment-of-the-handicapped contest conducted in the great 23d Congressional District of California on the subject of "How My Community Benefits From the Abilities of the Handicapped Worker."

The first-place winner was Ralph A. Sorensen, of Lynwood, Calif., a student at Lynwood High School, who won a \$50 bond, and the second-place winner was Cheree Noyon, of Compton, Calif., a student at Dominguez High School, who won a \$25 bond. I am sure you join with me in complimenting these young Americans and the contest committee under the leadership of Mrs. Lillian Karnes, a distinguished veteran, now of Lakewood, Calif., but who for many years lived in the congressional district which I have the honor of representing.

The essays follow:

HOW MY COMMUNITY BENEFITS FROM THE ABILITIES OF THE HANDICAPPED WORKER

(By Ralph A. Sorensen)

How does my community benefit from the abilities of handicapped workers? I am proud to be a citizen of a community that has realized that the physically disabled are valuable assets, not pitiful liabilities.

"Valuable asset?" one queries. "How can an individual, deformed or demented by war, disease, or accident, be of any practical use to anyone?" Let us look at the record. Two of the greatest military generals of history, Julius Caesar and Napoleon Bonaparte, were both epileptics. Halleyrand, Darwin, Franklin Roosevelt, Steinmetz, and Toulouse-Lautrec were all crippled, yet the philosophies, inventions and works of art of these

handicapped men have changed the course of history. Ludwig von Beethoven was so deaf he could not hear a note of his symphonies, yet his music has thrilled generations. Incredible? Yes. But these are just a few of the world's celebrities who, in spite of maybe because of their disabilities, became great. The list goes on and on, each example a blow to the myth that handicapped means useless.

In our community, the situation is one of give and take—the community gives the handicapped the tools and training, and in turn reaps the harvest of an able and productive working force.

A prime example of the work being done in our community can be found in the near-by Community Rehabilitation Industries, a private foundation designed to rehabilitate the handicapped person so that he may face the world again with as much to offer as the next man. Inside the walls of this center can be found men, some crippled, some blind or deaf, yet all performing tasks that benefit themselves and their communities. For these men are re-learning to perform simple tasks that they once performed without a second thought until fate struck them down. When they graduate from the center, as have over 200 persons, they will move into industry as very capable employees. Community Rehabilitation Industries is but one of several such organizations in our area, both State and private, all with the purpose of tapping this oft neglected resource.

Our community today is a better place in which to live because of the abilities of handicapped workers. When it becomes common knowledge that the handicapped worker is an able, diligent, and productive member of society; when man realizes that the physically disabled person is an asset to his community, rather than a millstone around the community's economy; then the entire world will be a better place in which to live.

NOT CHARITY—BUT A CHANCE

(By Cheree Noyon)

The handicapped are not first blind or deaf or crippled; they are first human beings. This means they should not be designated as a faceless mass, but rather judged as individuals. Many times we have a tendency to forget that the deaf or blind are not all alike, that they all have personalities and skills of their own.

These people do not like to be lumped together, pitied and prejudiced against. They want to prove their worth as individuals, and they are determined to have an equal chance. Being handicapped seems to endow them with a will. They work harder and better at their jobs. They are more careful in industrial work knowing well what kind of consequences an accident may have. They are also very conscientious, because there are few second chances for the handicapped in employment. Their roles in society are useful and varied. They range from housewives, draftsmen and industrial workers to authors, artists, lecturers, and teachers. They fulfill their roles as well or better than anyone.

It is a mistake to single out the handicapped as objects of pity. For they do not want pity or charity—only an equal chance. The odds against them are high, therefore their triumphs are double victories. They must have spirit and they do. Beethoven did much of his greatest work after he had lost his hearing. When he realized he would be deaf, he bravely challenged, "I shall take fate by the throat." And that he did. He wrote the most beautiful, powerful music the world has heard. He wrote it without ears—from his heart. He is a wonderful example of a great man with perseverance, strength and soul. He should serve as a lesson to us that even though the handi-

A1262

capped have physical deficiencies, their souls and minds are sound and true. They are courageous, faithful people and there are no finer virtues than these. Helen Keller, Frances Butler, Helen Morgan, and many others surmounted seemingly impossible odds to become useful contributors to our culture. These people are certainly not to be pitied but honored and respected. Why then should be pity others so afflicted?

The handicapped often have to cope with pitying stares and comments. It is to their credit they receive these calmly and even with humor. There is a story of a disabled Korean veteran who had lost one of his legs. At the hospital where he was convalescing, a woman looked at him with too obvious pity and exclaimed, "Why you poor boy. You've lost your leg." This would have been a very embarrassing moment for the GI, but he was equal to the situation and responded with a tone of surprise while glancing at his leg, "Why I'll be dog-goned if I haven't."

The handicapped's biggest problem is society's general condescending opinion toward them. In order to eliminate this feeling, it is necessary to promote understanding. This can only be done by interaction between them and general society. The Paul Binner classes of today's public schools are a start. Here deaf children attend the same schools as the other students. Through association students learn to regard the deaf and dumb not with aversion or pity; they learn to accept them as individuals just like themselves. We need more education of the public in these matters.

Where there is understanding there is no fear. And it is true we often fear the handicapped. We do not know how to treat them. We feel somehow they ought to be treated differently from other people. This is not so. Try to imagine yourself as a handicapped person. Would you be any less a person? Would you feel less, care less, understand less?

They don't either.

¹ Reader's Digest, December 1955.

Cook County Group Backs Antidetergent Pollution Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the widespread support for legislation to prevent continued detergent pollution in America is a reflection of the seriousness with which the people of this country view this growing problem.

Groups that have focused their attention on the Nation's water resources have been in the forefront of those endorsing the efforts to force a switch to decomposable detergents.

Such a group is the Cook County Clean Streams Committee. Because the feelings of this group are typical of those of organizations in other metropolitan centers, I particularly call the Cook County committee's stand to the attention of Members representing urban areas.

Excerpts from their statement follow:

Our Cook County Clean Streams Committee is delighted to learn that you have

introduced into Congress H.R. 2105, which, if passed, would make it unlawful to import into the United States or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce, any detergent after June 30, 1965, unless such detergent conforms with standards of decomposability prescribed pursuant to section 3 of this act.

The rapidly growing use of detergents in the United States is making our rivers and streams not only unsightly but also is threatening the purity of our water supplies. We feel that H.R. 2105 is a sorely needed measure that should receive the full support of the Izaak Walton League, sportsmen's clubs, and all organizations interested in maintaining pure water supplies. We shall do all that we can to support this measure.

I would note that the approach embodied in H.R. 2105 together with amendments to add to the effectiveness of the legislation have been included in a new antidetergent pollution bill, H.R. 4571.

Cuba People Have No Intention of Keeping Quiet When They Feel Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in these days when there is so much controversy over Cuba it is of considerable interest to read the views of responsible people in Florida who are so close to the situation. One of the best statements I have read in recent weeks is expressed in the editorial of Jack Gore in the Fort Lauderdale News of February 12.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that others may benefit from its message:

PEOPLE HAVE NO INTENTION OF KEEPING QUIET WHEN THEY FEEL THREATENED

The appeal voiced by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball this past Sunday night for Americans to stop talking so much about the Cuban situation and sit back and let it develop, emphasizes once again the important role that public opinion plays in the determination of national policies.

Under Secretary Ball strongly believes that now that all the facts about the Cuban deal have been given to Congress and the public everybody should unite in a common shell, keep their traps shut and throw their unlimited support behind our Government's efforts to resolve the situation.

In ordinary circumstances Ball's advice would be very sound counsel well worth heeding. But this advice presupposes something that just does not exist in the Cuban situation. It presumes that our Government is taking direct and forceful action to protect the interests of the citizens it represents and that a great majority of these citizens are well satisfied with the results that have accrued from this action.

We wish this were true but the commotion that is currently being raised over Cuba signifies just the opposite, and a large part of this commotion is being engendered by people who don't have any political axes to grind but who are definitely interested in preserving basic policies this Nation has followed for a good many years.

There are, we think, just as many Democrats as Republicans interested in trying to

find out what has happened to the Monroe Doctrine these past few months. We wouldn't call abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine a partisan political issue. Yet, to hear some people talk today, anybody who brings up such a basic question is trying to make political fodder out of the Cuban situation.

We have always felt that partisan politics should stop where the real security of this Nation begins. Thus, anything that affects the security of this country, in our book, should be argued not on a political basis but on an America first basis.

People can disagree with national policies that affect our security without being considered disloyal. In fact, we think they not only have a right but a responsibility to do just this as we haven't yet reached the point in this Nation where a political administration's word is the law and everybody has to bow and scrape before it.

It is argued that all the current furor over Cuba is apt to create the impression abroad that we are a disunited people not capable of throwing our shoulders behind a common wheel. But, in this respect, we are like two brothers fighting among themselves but who can and do instantly unite when they are threatened by an outside force.

Fortunately, in our political system, the force of public opinion cannot be ignored too long. When it is mustered behind any given objective it can literally move anything before it including a stubborn Congress, a muddle-headed State Department or a recalcitrant administration.

It was public opinion, as evidenced by a rising furor in the Congress, that eventually forced administration officials to suddenly change their tune last fall and recognize the seriousness of the growing Russian missile threat in Cuba before it was too late. Now, it is public opinion again which has once more forced administration officials to come out in the open and admit facts which, if they had their way, would be better left covered up.

All this goes far beyond partisan politics. It is not just Republicans or Democrats who are threatened by the growing Soviet menace in Cuba and the rest of the Caribbean. It is America and Americans and anytime anybody starts playing politics with their security it is time to call a halt to such a dangerous game.

Personally, we don't give a whit whether the Cuban problem started primarily with the Eisenhower or the Kennedy administration. This is water under the dam and bickering over this serves no useful purpose beyond a certain point. But we do care about what is or isn't being done about the Cuban problem right now, and so should every other American who is the least bit interested in winning the fight against communism.

If this administration has committed itself to scrapping the Monroe Doctrine and living with a Communist bastion 90 miles from our shores then it ought to have the guts to say as much instead of beating around the bush. If it hasn't scrapped the Monroe Doctrine as the basic policy of our country then it is time not only to say this forthrightly but to take firm action to give its words weight.

People get confused and petulant primarily when they don't know or can't find out in just which direction their leaders are taking them and their country. That is why Americans are confused and petulant right now. They see an admitted menace to their security in their backyard but they see little being done about it. They want something done, and until they have some clear evidence that it is being done, we doubt they will take Undersecretary George W. Ball's advice to stop asking embarrassing questions of the administration.

JACK W. GORE.

Khrushchev promised to pull out some of the estimated 17,000 military personnel by March 15—and indeed a handful, not more than a few hundred, have left in the last few days. Four other ships are known to be on the way. Careful reconnaissance and intelligence estimate that they can take approximately 7,000.

Thus it becomes a matter of simple subtraction. Deducting 7,000 from 17,000 leaves 10,000, and there has been absolutely no indication—at least as far as the administration has put out—that Khrushchev has any intention of removing any more. In fact the indications are the other way around; that he is determined not to remove any more.

Informed guesses are (A) that he will use the Soviet military presence in Cuba for all its propaganda worth throughout Latin America, (B) that he does not trust the Cubans to handle Soviet "defensive" weapons on the island, and (C) to protect Castro. All are probably correct.

It is fantastic to fear that the Soviet troops would be used to invade the United States or any other part of the hemisphere. Our response would be immediate and overwhelming.

But it is not fantastic at all to conclude they are being used to train Castro troops in infiltration and subversion; that their continued presence would be a festering sore in our prestige; or finally that to acquiesce in their remaining in Cuba would be to agree with Khrushchev that the Monroe Doctrine is dead.

The administration cannot acquiesce. Because the Soviet troops do not pose a direct military peril, it cannot condone their presence as a minor irritant.

I repeat a suggestion first made here February 10. It has since been reinforced by similar stands by former President Truman, Senator John Sherman Cooper, and many others.

If after X date it becomes clear that Khrushchev has no intention of removing the remaining troops, I suggest President Kennedy should give him Y days to do so.

If he does not do so in Y days, the United States and all other members of the hemispheric family would throw a complete quarantine ring around Cuba and allow nothing—repeat nothing—into the island, by sea or air.

As the Common Market of the new Europe begins to sound uncommonly like the old Europe, still another old controversy is being heard from again.

It is the relationship of Spain, its aging dictator Generalissimo Francisco Franco and the strategy of the West's historic conflict with world communism.

Now whenever this is raised numerous people go into tizzies, from left to right; few issues in recent history aroused such violent emotionalism as the Spanish civil war of the late 1930's.

This barbaric affair, often called the rehearsal for World War II, was won by Franco by dint of massive aid in men and material from Hitler and Mussolini. Franco's name is, accordingly, still undeniably a dirty word in many parts, here and abroad.

But Franco later denied Hitler land access to Gibraltar, thus preventing him from bottling up the Mediterranean. He told me he did this because he felt the 1939 pact between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia absolved him from any obligation to Hitler.

Whatever his reasons were—he may have had a sneaking suspicion Hitler wouldn't win anyway—the fact is that he did it. In my opinion, and strictly from the viewpoint of military history, he has never received adequate recognition for this.

Looking at the Spanish question today, in the equally cold light of current military problems, it seems strange that so strategic

an area has not been as fully integrated into the defense system of Western Europe.

Recent reports have hinted Spain is seeking NATO membership as the price for Pólaris use of its big Rota naval base at Cadiz. Well, I fail to see why this should even be an issue.

There seems to be little logic in continued exclusion of Spain from NATO.

If the dictatorial nature of the Spanish regime is offered as the reason, how can one rationalize the membership of Prime Minister Salazar's Portugal, hardly a parliamentary democracy. If his association with Germany and Italy is offered as a reason—then how come they are in NATO?

The Pyrenees Mountains, separating the Iberian Peninsula from the rest of Europe, constitute the only really effective natural land barrier in NATO's sphere of interest. A huge U.S. investment, in the form of great air and naval bases, has been poured onto Spanish soil. And one merely need look back again to World War II and the crucial necessity of the Straits of Gibraltar to recognize the immensely strategic nature of this corner of Europe.

In addition, the political complexion of the south shore of the Mediterranean has undergone radical changes since the Franco question first raised its head. Morocco and Algeria, once French, are now independent nations, both with dubious attitudes to the East-West face-off.

In short, Franco Spain—regardless of its domestic politics or even lack of them—should be a solid link in the NATO chain. Britain, Norway, Denmark, and Belgium oppose this, apparently seeing Franco only as a former pal of Hitler and Mussolini. And any one of these can veto Spanish NATO membership. These countries should reorientate, at least re-examine, their views purely in the harsh light of national survival.

When Hitler attacked Russia on June 22, 1941, Winston Churchill addressed the world. He said he had been a lifelong foe of communism and would remain so. But he added he would march with the Devil himself to defeat Hitler.

Spain is more important to NATO than Franco's old alliances are a threat to Europe's safety.

Motivation Worries Moulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

MR. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of a newspaper article clipping from the Springfield Daily News, Springfield, Mo., which was sent forward by Hon. Morgan Moulder, a former member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for several years. This statement was made by Mr. Moulder's cousin, Thomas Moulder, a member of the Springfield Board of Education.

The article follows:

BEHIND SHOWING OF TWO MOVIES TO TEACHERS—MOTIVATION WORRIES MOULDER

A Springfield School Board member who said he is worried about the motivation behind the showing of two movies at teachers' meeting Monday night demanded to know last night whether contents of the film might be used in classroom work.

Board member E. Thomas Moulder, who cited an article in Tuesday's Springfield Daily News as the basis of his worries, referred to the show of "Operation Abolition" and "Operation Correction."

Calling for the teaching of "pure, unadulterated, jingoistic Americanism" in the city's schools, Moulder said he is not seeking to abridge the right of freedom of speech, but that this freedom does not include the right of a teacher to teach anything he or she may want to teach.

The "Abolition" movie was based on 1960 riots in San Francisco, which the House Un-American Activities Committee says were Communist-led. The second film purported to be a correction of the first situation shown.

Former Congressman O. K. Armstrong and Dr. William McClure conducted a commentary on the two films.

Moulder's statement:

"Gentlemen, I wish to read into the minutes of this meeting this article taken from page 15 of the Tuesday, February 12, 1963, issue of the Springfield (Mo.) Daily News. The article is headlined '2 "Operation" Movies Bring Lively Claims.'"

"Now, gentlemen, I do not mean to imply by this statement that any individual, group, or organization is communistic or Communist dominated. I do, however, want to make my views quite clear concerning this matter both to the board of education, to the teachers of the Springfield Public Schools, and to the general public of Springfield.

"I am concerned that a movie would be shown at a teachers meeting that, in the words of the newspaper, and again I quote, 'purports to correct the abolition movie and attacks the congressional committee.' I am worried about the possible motivation behind the organization of a teachers meeting to hear a program on riots that took place in 1960 and have not been a matter of public interest since that time.

"Of course, a program of this type could possibly be of interest to a teacher of political science or an allied field. Were all of the teachers present at this meeting in this category? And whether they were or were not political science teachers, I am interested in knowing what use will be made of this material in the classrooms of the Springfield school system. The question also arises in my mind if this was an attempt at indoctrination in a liberal political philosophy, or if it was simply an innocuous showing of two movies with a commentary following for the employment of a group of teachers.

"I do not want to abridge the right of freedom of speech. This is not my purpose, as abridged freedom of speech is one of the noteworthy disgraces of the Communist dictatorship. However, I submit to you that the American principle of freedom of speech does not include a right for a teacher to teach anything he or she may want to teach in his or her classroom. I do not deny that any individual or group of individuals may, if they wish, view this movie or any other movie; but when it takes place at a teachers' meeting on school premises, I believe that the board and the public have a right to inquire and to know the purpose of such a viewing.

"Now, I address myself to the following portion of my statement not only as a member of the board of education but also as a parent, a taxpayer, a patron of the Springfield Public Schools, and above all as a citizen of the finest country on the face of the earth, the United States of America. I do not want my son taught disrespect for the U.S. Congress, or for any of its committees, or for any other duly constituted authority. I don't want him to be taught that there is any compromise with communism, that there is even a hint of a possibility that communism might be right, or that commu-

A1270

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 7

nism might be anything but a threat to his freedom and well-being.

"I realize, of course, that we cannot teach the values of freedom and democracy in a vacuum; that it is well and wise that a contrast be shown. This can certainly be done through the medium of a well developed curriculum and properly oriented instructors who will see to it that their students are taught Americanism and not communism.

"In that connection I wish to read an excerpt from an article in tonight's issue (Wednesday, February 13, 1963) of the Springfield Leader and Press, on the front page of that paper, entitled, 'Communism Study in State.'

"I am an American and I'm proud of it. My son is an American, and I want him to be taught Americanism; pure, unadulterated, jingoistic Americanism. I am dogmatic on this subject, and I admit to no other way than this in teaching about our Government. I believe, too, that I have the wholehearted support of the large majority of Springfieldians and Americans on this matter."

About 30 persons attended the Monday night showing, which was under sponsorship of the Association of Classroom Teachers of Springfield. George Buckley, Parkview teacher who acted as master of ceremonies, declared:

"All comments I have heard were very favorable that meetings of this type were of a very high professional caliber."

Cuba
Confusion of News Stories on Cuba and Failure of Administration To Tell the Truth Makes Us Wonder What Is Going on in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, confusion continues to surround the question of Cuba. We read many accounts in the newspapers; that there are thousands of Russian troops in Cuba, that many have been pulled out, that a few have been pulled out, that the missiles have all been removed, that the missiles have not been removed, that many weapons potentially dangerous to the United States are hidden in thousands of caves in Cuba. The President does little to clear up the situation and seems to be as much in the dark as to the actual facts pertaining to the Russian military buildup in Cuba as the most ill-informed citizen. We surely cannot believe the President is completely uninformed, therefore we must come to the conclusion that he is deliberately keeping the truth from the American people and only giving out, through his management of the news, such items as he believes will keep the American people in the dark.

Well, here is something to think about in the two following newspaper articles. One from the Chicago Tribune giving an eye-witness account of the great number of Russians in Cuba, the other from the Copley News Service pointing to the development of Cuba as a Soviet nuclear sub base. Could it be that the technicians in Cuba are actually submarine personnel and maintenance crews? How

long is President Kennedy going to allow this buildup to continue—until Khrushchev is strong enough to make further demands upon us, or until just before the next election when it could well be too late?

The articles follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

REPORTS MANY RUSSIANS AND GUNS IN CUBA
(By Knowlton Nash)

(NOTE.—Reporters and cameramen from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation have returned from Cuba, where they filmed a report for the Canadian network. Here are the impressions of one of the group, the network's Washington correspondent.)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—Two of the most striking impressions you get in Cuba are that there are so many guns and so many Russians.

Almost half of the people carry machine-guns, rifles, or pistols. To a Canadian, it seems a little unusual to be greeted by a hotel doorman carrying a Czechoslovak burp gun or by a pistol-packing room clerk. Militia boys and girls, some as young as 15, carry guns. One young militia girl I saw was carrying a rifle almost bigger than she was.

I went to a Russian motion picture and noticed that many boys and girls on dates lugged along their guns—a somewhat incongruous sight as they held hands with one hand and carried their guns with the other.

MEASURE OF ALARM

While initially, at least, there is a measure of alarm at the sight of so many guns, you get a feeling of some frustration at the sight of so many Russians.

Cubans constantly mistook us for Russians, apparently believing any fair-haired person is a Soviet citizen.

While I saw literally hundreds of Russians dressed in civilian clothes wandering about Havana or jammed in the back of trucks rushing to factories, I saw few Chinese. The Chinese that I did see were the most properly dressed of anybody in Cuba, even wearing ties, something the Russians and Cubans generally do not do.

Food is very short in Cuba, although nobody is starving, and it is expensive in restaurants. Stringy pork and elderly chicken are the main dishes, along with rice. Outside Havana, the food is rather less appetizing.

RATIONS ARE TIGHT

The Cubans themselves are on tight rations, including one chicken a month, one-eighth of a pound of butter a month, and five eggs a month, if you can get them.

We were in Cuba at the height of the sugarcane cutting season and the Government had launched a nationwide campaign for volunteer cutters. The No. 2 man in Cuba and its economic czar, Ernesto (Che) Guevara, spent 2 weeks cutting cane himself in Camaguey Province.

It was in the cane fields that I interviewed him. The interview was conducted in a semicircle of his guards, all carrying machine-guns, rifles, pistols, and machetes. I found it a bit inhibiting at first, but you get used to it after a while.

GLAD TO TALK

Guevara was only too glad to answer any question and this seemed to be the attitude of the Cuban people. Those who support the Castro government are proud of their guns, their communism, and the houses and hospitals they have built. Those who oppose Castro are equally anxious to talk, but only when you are out of earshot of any intelligence operatives or microphones.

When I came out of Cuba the first things I did were to sink my teeth into a juicy steak and luxuriate in being able to say anything I wanted without looking over my shoulder.

[From the Copley News Service]

U.S. EXPERTS LOOK TO CUBA AS SOVIET NUCLEAR SUB BASE

President Kennedy's decision to replace land-based intermediate-range missiles in Britain, Turkey, and Italy with Polaris submarines underscores a dangerous aspect of the Cuban situation.

The possibility of Russian missile submarines operating out of Cuban ports worries U.S. Navy and Pentagon intelligence officers. Such a move quickly would restore the Soviet firepower lost when Premier Khrushchev withdrew 42 missiles and more than 30 jet bombers from the island.

Navy experts report that they have no evidence of Russian submarine operations in Cuban waters. They admit, however, that several excellent submarine bases are available. Cuban exiles have insisted for several months that many of the Soviet "technicians" on the island are building submarine facilities. They also have reported sighting Soviet subs, although no missile submarines have been claimed.

The U.S. Navy is particularly concerned about announced Soviet plans to build "fishing bases" in Cuba. Such a base, Navy men say, easily could handle submarines.

No one in the Navy minimizes the Soviet undersea potential. Top priority has been given U.S. antisubmarine developments in the face of a Red fleet of between 400 and 500 submersibles. It is the largest submarine force in the world and at least 250 are modern, snorkel craft built after World War II.

An undisclosed number are capable of firing nuclear missiles. Most of these missile subs must surface before firing, but Russia now claims it has craft similar to the American Polaris fleet ballistic missile subs that can fire while submerged.

Forty to fifty Russians subs belong to the largest Z class. The others are Q or W types. The first announcement of nuclear-powered Red subs came last July 21. A few weeks ago Moscow claimed that one of its nuclear subs sailed under the Arctic icepack and surfaced at the North Pole.

U.S. intelligence reports this distribution of the Russian submarine force:

Northern (Arctic)—no medium range, 110 long range.

Baltic Sea—50 medium range, 40 long range.

Black Sea—5 medium range, 70 long range.

Pacific and Far East—50 medium-range, 60 long range.

This adds up to 385 operational submarines. Their distribution indicates strategic deployment in long-range operations.

Aside from being able to attack Western sea communications, Russian subs also could, as the U.S. Navy has said, operate directly off U.S. coasts from their bases in the U.S.S.R.

Russian bases in Cuba, of course, would constitute an even greater menace.

Soviet seapower's strategic threat to the United States is dramatized in the Navy's huge antisubmarine warfare plotting room at Norfolk, Va. On a giant wall-to-wall map, black diamond-shaped markers indicate goblins. That's the U.S. Navy's nickname for Russian subs presumed to be roaming the seas.

In one recent 6-month plotting period, the map showed 186 separate reports of what may have been Soviet submarines. Apparently some of them, from their positions, were probing American submarine defenses, testing the Navy's detection and tracking proficiency.

Close contacts between United States and Russian submarines are rare. Soviet subs, however, frequently are tracked by American undersea craft as part of realistic training exercises.